DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 198 167	TM 810 135
TITLE	Program Evaluation Summaries, 1979-80.
INSTITUTION	Dallas Independent School District, Tex. Dept. of Research and Evaluation.
REPORT NO	RE80-899-61-30
PUB DATE	Sep 80
NOTE	119p.
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Compensatory Education: *Educational Objectives: Elementary Secondary Education: *Program Administration: *Program Budgeting: *Program Content: *Program Evaluation
IDENTIFIERS	*Dallas Independent School District TX: Elementary Secondary Education Act Title I: Elementary Secondary Education Act Title IV: Emergency School Aid Act 1972

ABSTRACT

Evaluation summaries for 56 programs implemented by The Dallas Independent School District during the 1979-80 school year are highlighted in this report. Each summary is listed under one of the following sections: Title I Projects: State Compensatory Education Projects: Emergency School Aid Act Projects: Title IV-C Projects: and Other Projects. Information provided for each summary includes: (1) name of evaluator: (2) allocated budget; (3) number of pupils: (4) cost per pupil: (5) number of schools; (6) allocated staff: (7) description of the program: (8) objective: (9) evaluation results: (10) interpretation: and (11) reference to the report on which the summary is based. (RL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED198167

TM 810 135

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

W. J. Webster

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

DEPARTMENT
OF
RESEARCH AND EVALUATION

dallas independent school district

Linus Wright, *General Superintendent*

Dallas Independent School District
Linus Wright, General Superintendent

Accountability and Development Division
William J. Webster
Associate Superintendent

Department of Research and Evaluation
C. LaVor Lym
Deputy Assistant Superintendent

PROGRAM EVALUATION SUMMARIES, 1979-80

RE80-899-61-30

Approved report of the
Department of Research and Evaluation

C. LaVor Lym
C. LaVor Lym, Ph.D.
Deputy Assistant Superintendent
Research and Evaluation

William J. Webster
William J. Webster, Ph.D.
Associate Superintendent
Accountability and Development

Dallas, Texas
September 1980

Table of Contents

Page

Title-I Projects

T180-340 Evaluation of the 1979-80 Title-I Reading Program 1

T180-341 Evaluation of the 1979-80 Title-I Mathematics Program 3

T180-346 Evaluation of the 1979-80 Title-I Migrant Tutoring Program. 5

T180-348 Evaluation of the 1979-80 Title-I Staff Development Component 7

T180-349 Evaluation of the 1979-80 Title-I Community Involvement Component 9

T180-350 Evaluation of the 1979-80 Title-I Tutorial Program at Buckner Baptist Children's Home 11

T180-350 Evaluation of the 1979-80 Title-I Tutorial Program at Dallas County Boys Home 13

T180-350 Evaluation of the 1979-80 Title-I Tutorial Program at Dallas County Child Welfare 15

T180-350 Evaluation of the 1979-80 Title-I Tutorial Program at Dallas County Juvenile Detention Center 17

T180-350 Evaluation of the 1979-80 Title-I Tutorial Program at Dallas House. 19

T180-350 Evaluation of the 1979-80 Title-I Tutorial Program at Juliette Fowler Home. 21

T180-350 Evaluation of the 1979-80 Title-I Tutorial Program at Rotary Townhouse, Inc.. 23

T180-351 Evaluation of the Non-Public Title-I Schools, 1979-80: Catholic Diocese of Dallas, Mt. St. Michael and St. Joseph Center 25

T180-353 Evaluation of the 1980 Title-I Summer Program: Catholic Diocese of Dallas. 27

T180-354 Evaluation of the 1980 Title-I Summer Program 29

15

Page

State Compensatory Education Projects

CE80-300 Evaluation of the 1979-80 State Compensatory Education Basic Skills Core K-6 Program 31

CE80-301 Evaluation of the 1979-80 State Compensatory Education Basic Communications Skills 7-12 Project 33

CE80-302 Evaluation of the 1979-80 State Compensatory Education Computer-Assisted Instructional (CAI) Mathematics Program 35

CE80-303 Evaluation of the 1979-80 State Compensatory Education Project: Using a Direct Instruction Model to Teach Advanced Reading and Thinking to Underachieving Elementary and Middle School Students. 37

CE80-304 Evaluation of the 1979-80 State Compensatory Education Standard English as a Second Dialect for Speakers of a Non-Standard English Dialect Project 39

CE80-305 Evaluation of the State Compensatory Education (SCE) Reading Technology for Mastery Learning Project, 1979-80. 41

CE80-306 Evaluation of the 1979-80 State Compensatory Education Project--An Aesthetic Instructional Program: Implications for Reading and Mathematics 43

CE80-307 Evaluation of the 1979-80 State Compensatory Education Summer School Project 45

CE80-308 Evaluation of the 1979-80 State Compensatory Education Evaluation Component. 47

Emergency School Aid Act Projects

EE80-310 Evaluation of the 1979-80 Emergency School Aid Act (ESAA) Basic Project, Grades 4-6. 49

EE80-311 Evaluation of the 1979-80 Emergency School Aid Act (ESAA) Basic Project, Grade 7-8 Schools 51

EE80-312 Evaluation of the 1979-80 Emergency School Aid Act (ESAA) Basic Project, Magnet School Reading Program 53

Page

EE80-313 Evaluation of the 1979-80 Emergency School Aid Act (ESAA) Basic Project, Human Relations and Guidance. 55

EE80-314 Evaluation of the 1979-80 Emergency School Aid Act (ESAA) Basic Project, Administrative Services 57

EE80-315 Evaluation of the 1979-80 Emergency School Aid Act (ESAA) Pilot Project. 59

EE80-316 Evaluation of the Emergency School Aid Act (ESAA) Basic Project, Special Student Concerns. 61

EE80-317 Evaluation of the 1979-80 Emergency School Aid Act (ESAA) Basic Project, Community Relations 63

EE80-318 Evaluation of the Emergency School Aid Act (ESAA) Special Compensatory Project, 1979-80. 65

EE80-319 Evaluation of the 1979-80 Emergency School Aid Act (ESAA) Basic Project, Bilingual Component 67

EE80-320 Evaluation of the 1979-80 Emergency School Aid Act (ESAA) Program in the Private Non-Profit Schools. 69

EE80-329 Evaluation of the 1979-80 Emergency School Aid Act (ESAA) Bilingual Education Project. 71

EE80-330 Evaluation of the 1979-80 Emergency School Aid Act (ESAA) Basic Project, Cultural Crossroads Center 73

13

Title IV-C Projects

T480-321 Evaluation of the Title IV-C Developing Citizenship Education for Troubled Youth Project 75

T480-322 Evaluation of the Title IV-C Utah System Approach to Individualized Learning (U-SAIL) Program, 1979-80 77

T480-323 Evaluation of the 1979-80 Title IV-C Teams-Games-Tournament for Fundamentals of Mathematics Program 79

Page

T480-324 Evaluation of the 1979-80 Title IV-C Conceptually Oriented Mathematics Program (COMP). 81

T480-325 Evaluation of the Title IV-C Computer-Assisted Instructional System for Higher Order Reading Skills, 1979-80. 83

T480-326 Evaluation of the Supplemental Computer-Assisted Instructional System for Higher Order Mathematics Skills, 1979-80. 85

T480-327 Evaluation of the Title IV-C Survival Academic Skills for the Deaf Program, 1979-80 87

T480-331 Evaluation of the 1979-80 Title IV-C Model Accountability System 89

T480-334 Evaluation of the 1979-80 Title IV-C Occupational and Prevocational Training and Instructional Options for Special Education Students (Project OPTIONS). 91

Other Projects

T780-309 Evaluation of the 1979-80 Title VII Bilingual Demonstration Project 93

SP80-365 Evaluation of the Lincoln High School Renewal Project (LHSRP), 1979-80. 95

SP80-380 Evaluation of the 1979-80 Better Reading Through Parents (BRTP) Program. 97

SP80-381 Evaluation of the 1979-80 American Indian Education Program. 99

SP80-382 Evaluation of the 1979-80 Nutrition Education Project 101

SP80-383 Evaluation of the Summer Skills Youth Employment Program (SSYEP), 1979. 103

SP80-384 Evaluation of the 1979-80 Services Provided by the Dallas Chamber of Commerce for the Dallas Independent School District. 105

SP80-408 Evaluation of the Dunbar SUCCESS Program, 1979-80 107

Page

SP80-431 Evaluation of the Lau Program, 1979-80. 109

SP80-447 Evaluation of the 1979-80 Peer Tutoring Program. 111

Evaluation of the 1979-80 Title-I Reading Program

Evaluator:	Napoleon Mitchell		
Allocated Budget:	$3,343,703	Number of Pupils:	9,337
		Cost per Pupil:	$358
Number of Schools	56		
Allocated Staff:	.5 Assistant Director, 1.5 Coordinators, .5 Senior Analyst, 2.5 Facilitators, 38.4 Instructional Resource Teachers, 76 Reading Teachers, 94 Teacher Aides, 3 Substitute Teachers		

Description:

The Title-I reading program was designed to improve the language and reading skills of Title-I students in 56 schools in the Dallas Independent School District. This supplemental program did provide an appropriate staff as specified in the Title-I application, a minimum 20-minute instructional period, and a means of communication between the Minimum Foundation Program teachers and the Title-I staff.

Materials and personnel were provided to each school by Title-I funds. Each school possibly had an instructional resource teacher, a reading teacher, and/or reading teacher aide to provide 11 or 12 instructional periods per day with classes ranging in size from 8 to 15 students. The instructional program did not employ any particular reading materials as a core program.

Objective:

As specified in the Title-I application, upon completion of the 1979-80 school year a specified percentage of kindergarten students would attain certain percentile scores on the Metropolitan Readiness Test. By grade, a specified percentage of students in grades one through six would attain certain percentile gains as measured by the Reading Comprehension Test of the Iowa Tests of Basic Skills (ITBS).

Evaluation Results:

The achievement objectives specified in the proposal were met in kindergarten and grades one, four, five, and six throughout the District and in grade three in the Northeast Subdistrict. Grades two and three did not meet local objectives on the Reading Comprehension Test of the ITBS. For all grades combined, 25% of the Title-I students scored at or below chance on the test. In addition to evaluating the Title-I program against the criteria specified in the application, students' reading achievement was monitored by comparing Spring 1979 and Spring 1980 ITBS Reading Comprehension Test scores. The median percentiles for Title-I students in grades two through six are shown below:

	Grade 2	Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5	Grade 6
N	1085	1463	815	1113	1267
Spring 1979	15.6	7.2	5.7	4.3	5.7
Spring 1980	14.7	9.5	6.7	8.4	7.9

Of the students in grades one, two, and three, 7.3% scored at or above the 50th national percentile. In grades four, five, and six, 2.5% of the students scored at or above the national median.

Interpretation: The local program objectives for grades one through six specified a percentage of students who would gain certain numbers of percentile points. While it is very reasonable to state objectives in this manner, it is not possible to reach firm conclusions this year about the attainment of these objectives. The reason for this is found in the change from one test to another or from one form of a test to a newer one. First-grade pretests were MRT percentiles; while the posttests were ITBS Form 7 percentiles: the two norms groups were not the same. The pretest for grades two through six was ITBS Form 5 while the posttest was ITBS Form 7 or 8. The percentiles from Form 5 were converted to conform to the Form 7 or 8 norms. However, the real effect of this conversion is unknown. The reader is cautioned to interpret these results with the above limitations in mind.

Report: Mitchell, N. Evaluation of the 1979-80 Title-I Reading Program (T180-340-31-01). Dallas, Texas: Dallas Independent School District, Department of Research and Evaluation, September 1980.

Evaluation of the 1979-80
Title-I Mathematics Program

Evaluator:	Jerrilyn V. Andrews		
Allocated Budget:	$3,402,431	Number of Pupils:	9,398
		Cost per Pupil:	$362
Number of Schools:	56		
Allocated Staff:	.5 Assistant Director, 1.5 Coordinators, .5 Senior Analyst, 2.5 Facilitators, 20.4 Instructional Resource Teachers, 99 Mathematics Teachers, 95 Teacher Aides, 17 Computer-Assisted Instruction Aides		

Description: The Title-I Mathematics Program served educationally deprived kindergarten through sixth-grade students on 56 eligible campuses. Students were to receive at least 20 minutes of supplementary instruction daily in small groups. Instructional resource teachers, mathematics teachers and paraprofessionals were to provide instruction to 11 or 12 groups daily. The 13 highest priority campuses also received computer-assisted instruction (CAI) in mathematics. Title-I instruction was to be correlated with the minimum foundation program. A variety of instructional materials was available on each campus for use with eligible students.

Objective: The intent of the Title-I Mathematics Program was to improve the mathematics skills of participating students. The achievement of this goal was to be assessed for kindergarten children using the total battery of the Metropolitan Readiness Tests (MRT). The kindergarten goal was an improvement in the percentile distribution relative to the 1978-79 distribution. In first through sixth grades, the Mathematics Total score of the Iowa Tests of Basic Skills (ITBS) was the criterion variable. In these six grades the objectives called for 40% to 55% of the students to gain between 1 and 10 or more percentile points.

Evaluation Results: Program implementation was hampered by a shortage of teachers. In late September, 41 of the proposed 99 mathematics teacher positions were vacant; substitute teachers were not hired before mid-December. Observation of the program showed that class sizes were appropriate and instructional time generally equalled or exceeded 20 minutes. The CAI program began on time at Maynard Jackson; at the other 12 sites implementation was delayed until early 1980 due to the late arrival of the microcomputers.

With the exception of grade two, the District achievement objectives appeared to be fully met in all grades. The second-grade objectives, however, fell slightly short of attainment. Mathematics achievement of Title-I students was also monitored by comparing their Spring 1979 and Spring 1980 ITBS Mathematics Test scores. The median percentiles for Title-I students in grades two through six are given below:

	Grade 2	Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5	Grade 6
N	1093	1269	947	1256	1336
Spring 1979	12.6	6.44	4.7	2.2	2.2
Spring 1980	13.6	11.1	7.1	6.5	6.8

Other than at Maynard Jackson, the CAI program showed no effect above the regular Title-I mathematics program. Students in the fourth and fifth grades at Maynard Jackson had improved achievement attributed to the additional CAI program.

Interpretation: Although program objectives were generally attained, the change to the new ITBS makes it impossible to reach firm conclusions. Program implementation was delayed in many schools by shortages of teachers and late arrival of machines. A more efficient start-up was recommended.

Report: Andrews, J. V. Evaluation of the 1979-80 Title-I Mathematics Program. (T180-341-31-02). Dallas, Texas: Dallas Independent School District, Department of Research and Evaluation, September 1980.

T180-346

Evaluation of the 1979-80 Title-I Migrant Tutoring Program

Evaluators: Ramón Rincón
R. A. Zepeda

Allocated Budget: $237,088

Number of Pupils: 539/231 (see description)

Cost per Pupil: $1,026 (based on number of students tutored)

Number of Schools: 26

Allocated Staff: 1 Supervisor/Coordinator, 1 clerk/typist, 4 recruitment/community aides, 5 resource teachers, 52 tutors.

Description: The Title-I Migrant Tutoring Program (MTP) was designed and implemented to address the needs of migrant students by means of tutorial assistance in oral language, language arts and reading. Although the MTP budget allowed for 5 resource teacher positions, 2 of those positions were never filled. A total of 539 students were identified as migrants. The number involved in the tutoring program was 231. The MTP concentrated supplementary reading efforts on the identified migrant students who had below-average reading performances evidenced by achievement test scores. The tutors were bilingual paraprofessionals who were provided with some pre-service preparation. Tutors in this program, in collaboration with principals, resource teachers and classroom teachers, provided 20 minutes of tutoring daily in the areas of oral language development, language arts and reading, and using Spanish and/or English according to each student's need. Those migrant students whose test scores were at or below the 25th percentile were given priority attention. Materials for this program included supplementary materials, Bilingual Program materials, and District Baseline curriculum materials.

Objectives: At the conclusion of the project period 60% of the Title-I Migrant students were to make a gain of 20% in general ability as measured on the Inter-American Test Series: Test of General Ability and Prueba de Habilidad General. The remaining 40% of the students were to make a gain of 10% in a pre- and posttest design with tests administered in September 1979 and April 1980. By the conclusion of the project period, 80% of the parents were to have been involved in Title-I Migrant Program coordinated activities. Within two days after each migrant student was identified and recruited, eligibility forms for the student were to be transmitted to the Region X Education Service Center (ESC) terminal site.

Evaluation Results: Of the 24 students in grades one through five who took the Inter-American Prueba de Habilidad General (Spanish version) 38% achieved a 20% increase in raw score from fall to spring; 42% made an increase of 1-19%. Moderate achievement gains on the ITBS Reading Comprehension Test were demonstrated by MTP students in grades three, five, and six (gains of .9, .9 and .8 grade equivalent units, respectively). MTP students in grades 2 and 4 showed gains of .4 grade equivalents. Average reading grade equivalent scores for MTP students in the spring of 1980 were 1.7, 2.4, 3.0, 3.3, and 4.0 for grades two through six, respectively.

Recruitment/community aides visited every home of the identified migrant students. Approximately 2,000 home visits were made by these aides. Approximately 130 parents participated in Migrant Program coordinated activities. These recruitment/community aides transmitted records to the ESC terminal site as specified.

Interpretation: Moderate attainment of the instructional objectives was evidenced. The lack of two resource teachers weakened lines of communication between MTP personnel and local school personnel at the schools where these vacancies existed. Principals and teachers generally expressed support of the MTP. Principals appeared to have become better acquainted with migrant eligibility criteria, program guidelines and implementation than had been the case in the past. Very little staff development was provided during 1979-80 to the paraprofessional tutors.

Report: Rincón, R. and Zepeda, R. A. Evaluation of the 1979-80 Title-I Migrant Tutoring Program (T180-346-31-01). Dallas, Texas: Dallas Independent School District, Department of Research and Evaluation, September 1980.

T180-348

Evaluation of the 1979-80 Title-I Staff Development Component

Evaluators: Ed Dowgiallo
Jerrilyn V. Andrews

Allocated Budget: $459,524

Number of Pupils: Not Applicable

Cost per Pupil: Not Applicable

Number of Schools: 56 DISD, 11 Diocese of Dallas, 7 Institutions

Allocated Staff: 2 Coordinator/Supervisors, 10 Resource Teachers

Description: The Staff Development Program provided learning activities for personnel involved in Title-I. These took place at the Dunbar Teacher Education Center and 12 DISD schools.

Instructional personnel, principals of Title-I schools, Community Involvement personnel, and personnel from Research and Evaluation, Staff Development, the Learning Division, and Special Programs attended both joint workshops on general program concerns and separate workshops for personnel from each component. Additional workshops for new Title-I teachers and substitutes and demonstration sessions for classroom teachers from Title-I schools were provided. Other services included a resource library, a newsletter, and a creative ideas book for instructors.

Objective: Minimum numbers of hours of staff development to be provided for each group of Title-I personnel constituted the objectives of the program.

Evaluation Results: The program objectives were attained. In each case, the number of hours actually provided for each group of Title-I personnel equalled or exceeded the minimum.

The rate of attendance at staff development sessions was reasonably high. Title-I instructional personnel from all 56 DISD schools, from 9 of 11 Diocese schools, and from 3 of 7 institutions participated. Excluding instructors who were assigned after December, 188 teachers attended a mean of 34.6 hours out of the 42 hours provided. The attendance rates for Diocese and institution personnel were somewhat lower. Of the

DISD and Diocese paraprofessionals, 222 attended a mean of 18.9 hours out of the 26.5 hours provided. Principals or administrative representatives from all 56 DISD schools attended either one or both of the workshops provided for them. The rate of attendance by Community Involvement personnel was quite high. Attendance by Learning Division, Research and Evaluation, Staff Development, and Special Programs was somewhat lower than the other components. Classroom teachers from 23 DISD and 3 Diocese Title-I schools attended the demonstration sessions. Parents of Title-I children attended some of the 1979 summer workshops and demonstration sessions.

The responses and written comments made by participants on evaluation forms generally indicated that staff development sessions enhanced understanding of the topics covered. Participants typically reported that the workshops provided them with sufficient information and that they found the information potentially useful and applicable in their school situations. When asked to give concrete examples of practical information gained from specific workshops, many did so.

Interpretation:

The full attainment of program objectives, the satisfactory rate of attendance, and the positive feedback from participants indicated a highly successful implementation of the Title-I Staff Development Program. Program planning and administration seemed organized to a high degree.

Report:

Dowgiallo, E., and Andrews, J. V. Evaluation of the 1979-80 Title-I Staff Development Component (TI80-348-31-16). Dallas, Texas: Dallas Independent School District, Department of Research and Evaluation, September 1980.

Evaluation of the 1979-80 Title-I
Community Involvement Component

Evaluators:	William B. Rutherford Jerrilyn V. Andrews		
Allocated Budget:	$873,640	Number of Pupils:	13,510
		Cost per Pupil:	$65
Number of Schools:	54		
Allocated Staff:	31 Parent Ombudsmen, 13 Home/School Liaisons, 1 Coordinating Supervisor		

Description:

The Title-I Community Involvement Program (CIP) was designed as a non-instructional support component to assist parents of Title-I students in becoming involved in the learning process of their children. It was assumed that increased involvement of parents and other community members in the Title-I program would support the educational progress of students and minimize the potential barriers to that progess.

The goals of the CIP were to be attained through three major areas of activity: Parent Advisory Councils (PACs), student referrals, and parent training.

Objectives:

Upon completion of the project year, (a) the CIP staff will have coordinated local PAC activities and provided any needed technical assistance and support to accomplish the goals of the local PACs, (b) parent ombudsmen and home/school liaisons will have followed up all referrals to the CIP staff, and (c) Title-I workshops and parenting education workshops will have been conducted on each Title-I campus.

Evaluation Results: All parent ombudsmen were instrumental in the establishment and maintenance of a PAC on 54 Title-I campuses. During the 1979-80 school year parent ombudsmen conducted 447 PAC meetings with 6,525 parents attending. Parent ombudsmen also conducted Title-I instructional workshops and parent education workshops. Title-I workshops totalled 84 with 1,289 parents in attendance. Parent education workshops numbered 116 with 2,232 parents in attendance. District-wide referrals to the CIP staff totalled 13,510. Of those referrals, 7,073 (52%) were attendance-related. Home visits totalled 37,828 for an average of 2.8 home visits for each referral made. A study of attendance indicated a slight improvement of student attendance rates from 1978-79 to 1979-80.

Interpretation: A high incidence of attainment of the objectives of the CIP was evidenced during the project year. The major concerns of the staff as indicated in a survey were notifying parents that their children were eligible for Title-I services and limiting service to children who received instruction in a Title-I component, especially in families where more than one child was identified as Title-I-eligible but only one of the children was being served in a Title-I instructional component. Records indicated that high parental participation was maintained in the local PACs. Parental participation in workshops showed a marked increase of approximately 3,000 parents over 1978-79.

Report: Rutherford, William B., and Andrews, Jerrilyn V. Evaluation of the 1979-80 Community Involvement Program (T180-349-31-11). Dallas, Texas: Dallas Independent School District, Department of Research and Evaluation, September 1980.

T180-350

Evaluation of the 1979-80 Title-I Tutorial Program at Buckner Baptist Children's Home

Evaluators: Chan Roark and Richard G. Ferguson

Allocated Budget: $76,427

Number of Pupils: 191

Cost per Pupil: $400

Number of Schools 1

Allocated Staff: 1 Head Teacher, 1 Resource Teacher, 1 Home/School Resource Teacher, 1 Aide

Description: Elementary students were taught supplementary reading and mathematics at Edna Rowe Elementary School by the full-time head teacher and resource teacher. Students were pulled from their classes to a resource room in small groups of 2 to 5. Title-I periods lasted 30 minutes. Secondary students were taught reading and mathematics after school on the Buckner campus by a full-time home/school resource teacher, a half-time aide, and 35 volunteer tutors. Title-I classes were conducted in small groups of 10 to 12 students, and were 45 to 60 minutes in length. A summer school program was planned for elementary students. Information on the summer program was not available at the time this report was written.

Objective: In both reading and mathematics, 10% of the students served were to gain 10 percentile points or more on the Metropolitan Achievement Test, 20% of the students were to gain 7 to 9 percentile points, 40% of the students were to gain 4 to 6 percentile points, 20% of the students were to gain 1 to 3 percentile points, and 10% of the students were to make no gain or were to lose percentile points.

Evaluation Results: In reading, 43% of the students tested made gains of 10 percentile points or more. In mathematics, 51% of the students tested made such gains.

However, the objectives for losses or no gain were also exceeded in both subjects, with 29% of the students tested in reading and 22% of the students tested in mathematics either losing or making no gain. Additionally, in reading 8% of the students tested gained 7 to 9 percentile points, 11% of the students tested gained 4 to 6 percentile points, and 9% of the students tested gained 1 to 3 percentile points. In mathematics, 10% of the students tested gained 7 to 9 percentile points, 10% of the students tested gained 4 to 6 percentile points, and 7% of the students tested gained 1 to 3 percentile points. The Title-I program at Buckner was implemented as planned, except that after-school sessions for secondary students were not well-attended.

Interpretation: In general, the program's objectives were achieved to a moderate degree. Program plans were implemented faithfully, and the staff was organized and diligent.

Report: Ferguson, R. G., and Roark, C. Evaluation of the 1979-80 Title-I Tutorial Programs at Seven Non-Public Institutions (TI80-350-31-20). Dallas, Texas: Dallas Independent School District, Department of Research and Evaluation, September 1980.

Evaluation of the 1979-80 Title-I Tutorial Program at Dallas County Boys Home

Evaluators:	Richard G. Ferguson and Chan Roark		
Allocated Budget:	$13,811	Number of Pupils:	21
		Cost per Pupil:	$658
Number of Schools	1		
Allocated Staff:	1 Resource Teacher		

Description: A full-time teacher was hired in January of 1980. Students in grades 7 through 10 were pulled from regular classes at the on-campus school. Periods were 30 minutes in length. Reading and mathematics were taught to small groups of one to five students in a resource area at the school. The resource teacher planned to work the first six weeks of summer to use funds not spent during the fall of 1979. Information on this summer program was not available when this summary was written.

Objective: In reading, 10% of the students served were to gain .8 to 1.0 months per month of instruction as measured by their grade equivalent scores on the Wide Range Achievement Test, 15% of the students were to gain .4 to .7 months per month of instruction, 55% of the students were to gain .1 to .3 months per month of instruction, and 20% of the students were to make no gain or were to lose. In mathematics, 10% of the students served were to gain .5 to .6 months per month of instruction, 25% of the students were to gain .3 to .4 months per month of instruction, 40% of the students were to gain .1 to .2 months per month of instruction, and 25% were to make no gain or were to lose.

Evaluation Results: There were 79% of the students tested in reading who gained 1.1 months per month of instruction or more. Another 7% of the students tested in reading gained .8 to 1.0 months per month and 14% made no gain or lost. In mathematics, 43% of the students tested gained .7 months per month of instruction or more, and 57% of the students tested made no gain or lost. Overall, the Title-I program was implemented as planned, except that student selection for the programs was based more on the subjective judgments of the regular classroom teachers than on achievement test scores. Also, students were not always sent to Title-I classes by the regular classroom teachers.

Interpretation:

In general, the program objectives were met to a high degree in reading and to a moderate degree in mathematics. The program could become an excellent example of a Title-I program at an institution for delinquent youth if problems regarding student selection and attendance are corrected.

Report:

Ferguson, R. G., and Roark, C. Evaluation of the 1979-80 Title-I Tutorial Programs at Seven Non-Public Institutions (T180-350-31-20). Dallas, Texas: Dallas Independent School District, Department of Research and Evaluation, September 1980.

T180-350

Evaluation of the 1979-80 Title-I Tutorial Program at Dallas County Child Welfare

Evaluators: Richard G. Ferguson and Chan Roark

Allocated Budget: $40,399

Number of Pupils: 33

Cost per Pupil: $1,224

Number of Schools: 1

Allocated Staff: Regular School Program - 1 Coordinator/Supervisor, 9 Tutors; Summer School Program - 1 Coordinator/Supervisor, 8 Tutors, and 1 Teacher Aide

Description: Tutors worked 6 or 12 hours per week teaching reading and mathematics to students at their foster homes. Students were usually tutored individually for one or two hours each week. The grade levels of students were 1 through 9 and 12. The coordinator/supervisor worked 20 hours per week performing such duties as obtaining and training tutors, and coordinating the selection of students and matching them with tutors. A summer program was planned for June of 1980. Information on this summer program was not available when this summary was written.

Objective: The objectives in both reading and mathematics were that 10% of the students served were to gain 1.6 months or more per month of instruction as measured by their grade equivalent scores on the Wide Range Achievement Test, 10% of the students were to gain 1 to 1.5 months per month of instruction, 20% of the students were to gain .6 to .9 months per month of instruction, 50% of the students were to gain .1 to .5 months per month of instruction, and 10% of the students were to make no gain or were to lose.

Evaluation Results: In reading, 64% of the students tested gained .1 to .5 months per month of instruction, and 36% made no gain or lost. In mathematics, 6% of the students tested gained .6 to .9 months per month, 67% of the students tested gained .1 to .5 months per month of instruction, and 27% made no gains or lost. Overall, the Title-I program was implemented in an organized manner. Exceptions were that the amount of contact between tutors and students' regular school teachers was slight, and that the program's large stack of materials were only moderately used.

Interpretation: The program's objectives were not met. Gains were about the same in reading and mathematics. The program's low degree of impact as measured by these achievement scores was puzzling since this program was implemented in an organized fashion, and since tutoring was in most cases individually administered.

Report: Ferguson, R. G., and Roark, C. Evaluation of the 1979-80 Title-I Tutorial Programs at Seven Non-Public Institutions (T180-350-31-20). Dallas, Texas: Dallas Independent School District, Department of Research and Evaluation, September 1980.

T180-350

Evaluation of the 1979-80 Title-I Tutorial Program at Dallas County Juvenile Detention Center

Evaluators: Richard G. Ferguson and Chan Roark

Allocated Budget: $9,207

Number of Pupils: 338

Cost per Pupil: $27

Number of Schools: 1

Allocated Staff: 1 Tutor

Description: A full-time tutor was hired in January of 1980. Students in grades 3 through 12 were pulled from regular classes at the in-house school. Periods were 45 minutes in length. Reading and mathematics were taught to small groups of six students in a very small resource room.

Objective: Students were to show positive educational growth as measured by an attitude rating scale. Rating forms were completed at 30-day intervals by the regular classroom teachers.

Evaluation Results: Rating forms were obtained for 167 of the 338 students served. Of these 167, 161 had initial ratings only, and thus no comparison over time could be made. Three students had two ratings, and three other students had three ratings. These six students all showed either low gains, no gains, or losses on the scale. The major problem obtaining scores was that most students were at the Center only a very brief time. In general, the program was organized and implemented to a moderate degree. Several discrepancies existed between the program and the proposal. These included the fact that the tutor taught five rather than eight classes each day, and that the attitude rating scales were completed by the regular classroom teachers without input from the Title-I tutor.

Interpretation: The lack of ratings made it impossible to evaluate the program's objective. In institutions like this where the length of residence is so brief, it may not be possible to obtain meaningful objective data regarding student progress. Also, several areas of the program needed revision to bring the program into accordance with the proposal.

Report: Ferguson, R. G. and Roark, C. Evaluation of the 1979-80 Title-I Tutorial Programs at Seven Non-Public Institutions (T180-350-31-20). Dallas, Texas: Dallas Independent School District, Department of Research and Evaluation, September 1980.

T180-350

Evaluation of the 1979-80 Title-I Tutorial Program at Dallas House

Evaluators:	Richard G. Ferguson and Chan Roark		
Allocated Budget:	$4,604	Number of Pupils:	18
		Cost per pupil:	$256
Number of Schools:	1		
Allocated Staff:	1 Tutor		

Description: Students in grades 8 through 10 were taught reading and mathematics at the facility during the morning hours. The tutor worked 20 hours per week. Instruction was in small groups of one to six students. The length of periods varied, and was not one hour as specified in the proposal. Also, a daily schedule for seeing students was not devised. The tutor was absent on leave from November of 1979 until February of 1980. To use the funds not spent during this time, she planned to continue to work the same hours during the first six weeks of summer. Information on this summer program was not available at the time this report was written.

Objective: Objectives were expressed in terms of the percentage of raw score items answered correctly on the Metropolitan Achievement Test. Objectives in both reading and mathematics were that 15% of the students served were to gain 3 percentage points, 60% of the students were to gain 1 to 2 percentage points, and 25% of the students were to make no gain or were to lose.

Evaluation Results: In reading, 92% of the students tested gained 5 percentage points or more, and 8% gained 1 to 2 percentage points. In mathematics, 83% of the students tested gained 5 percentage points or more, and 17% gained 1 to 2 percentage points. The program was implemented in a moderately disorganized manner.

Interpretation:	The program's objectives were obtained to a very high degree in both subjects. This was notwithstanding the lack of organization which was observed within the program, as well as discrepancies between the program and the proposal, the high turnover rate at the facility, and the absence of tutoring during the three months the Title-I tutor was on leave. The attainment of the objectives under such adverse conditions strongly suggests that the standard of performance stipulated in the objectives was much too low.
Report:	Ferguson, R. G., and Roark, C. Evaluation of the 1979-80 Title-I Tutorial Programs at Seven Non-Public Institutions (T180-350-31-20). Dallas, Texas: Dallas Independent School District, Department of Research and Evaluation, September 1980.

T180-350

Evaluation of the 1979-80 Title-I Tutorial Program at Juliette Fowler Home

Evaluators: Richard G. Ferguson
and Chan Roark

Allocated Budget: $2,558

Number of Pupils: 16

Cost per Pupil: $160

Number of Schools: 1

Allocated Staff: 1 Tutor

Description: The tutor obtained 18 volunteer tutors who instructed students in reading and mathematics for one hour each evening. Students were in grades 7 through 12. The tutor spent most of her 10 weekly hours coordinating the programs and visiting students' school teachers. The tutor resigned on December 20, 1979, and a replacement was not found for the remainder of the school year.

Objective: The objectives in reading were that 10% of the students served were to gain 1.6 months or more per month of instruction as measured by their grade equivalent scores on the Wide Range Achievement Test, 20% of the students were to gain 1 to 1.5 months per month of instruction, 40% of the students were to gain .6 to .9 months per month of instruction, 20% of the students were to gain .1 to .5 months per month of instruction, and 10% of the students were to make no gain or were to lose. The objectives in mathematics were that 10% of the students were to gain 1 to 1.5 months per month of instruction, 50% of the students were to gain .6 to .9 months per month of instruction, 20% of the students were to gain .1 to .5 month per month of instruction, and 20% of the students were to make no gains or were to lose.

Evaluation Results: In reading, 40% of the students tested gained 1.6 months or more per month of instruction, 40% of the students tested gained .6 to .9 months per month of instruction, and 20% of the students tested gained .1 to .5 months per month of instruction. In mathematics, 20% of the students tested gained 1.6 months or more per month of instruction, 40% of the students tested gained 1 to 1.5 months per month of instruction, 20% of the students tested gained .6 to .9 months per month of instruction, and 20% of the students tested made no gains or lost. The Title-I tutor spent very little time instructing students.

Interpretation:

In general, the program's objectives were achieved to a moderately high degree in both subjects, even though the program was moderately disorganized. It should be mentioned that five students' scores, which is the number of students' scores available for data analysis, are generally considered an inadequate number on which to base an objective evaluation of a program's impact.

Report:

Ferguson, R. G., and Roark, C. Evaluation of the 1979-80 Title-I Tutorial Programs at Seven Non-Public Institutions (T180-350-31-20). Dallas, Texas: Dallas Independent School District, Department of Research and Evaluation, September 1980.

T180-350

Evaluation of the 1979-80 Title-I Tutorial Program at Rotary Townhouse, Inc.

Evaluators: Richard G. Ferguson and Chan Roark

Allocated Budget: $1,535

Number of Pupils: 19

Cost per Pupil: $81

Number of Schools: 1

Allocated Staff: 1 Tutor

Description: The tutor worked four hours per week instructing students in grades 7 through 10 in reading and mathematics. Instruction occurred individually or in small groups for periods of about 30 minutes each.

Objective: The objectives in reading were that 20% of the students served were to gain 1.1 months or more per month of instruction as measured by their grade equivalent scores on the Wide Range Achievement Test, 20% of the students were to gain .8 to 1 month per month of instruction, 25% of the students were to gain .4 to .7 months per month of instruction, 25% of the students were to gain .1 to .3 months per month of instruction, and 10% of the students were to make no gain or were to lose. The objectives in mathematics were that 15% of the students were to gain 1.1 months or more per month of instruction, 15% of the students were to gain .8 to 1 month per month of instruction, 30% of the students were to gain .4 to .7 months per month of instruction, 30% of the students were to gain .1 to .3 months per month of instruction, and 10% were to make no gain or were to lose.

Evaluation Results: In reading, 18% of the students tested gained 1.1 months or more per month of instruction, 9% of the students tested gained .8 to 1 month per month of instruction, 37% of the students tested gained .4 to .7 months per month of instruction, 27% of the students tested gained .1 to .3 months per month of instruction, and 9% of the students tested made no gain or lost. In mathematics, 15% of the students tested gained 1.1 months or more per month of instruction, 9% of the students tested gained .8 to 1 month per month of instruction, 46% of the students tested gained .4 to .7 months per month of instruction, and 27% of the students tested gained .1 to .3 months per month of instruction. Overall, the program functioned in an organized and efficient manner.

Interpretation:

In general, the objectives were not attained in reading but were moderately attained in mathematics. This is curious since the program was observed to be well-implemented throughout the year. It is also true that in cases like this where the number of scores is low, and where the turnover rate is high, the objective scores used to measure program impact may be invalid.

Report:

Ferguson, R. G., and Roark, Chan. Evaluation of the Title-I Tutorial Programs at Seven Non-Public Institutions (T180-350-31-20). Dallas, Texas: Dallas Independent School District, Department of Research and Evaluation, September 1980.

T180-351

Evaluation of the Non-Public Title-I Schools, 1979-80: Catholic Diocese of Dallas, Mt. St. Michael and St. Joseph Center

Evaluators: Becca Dyer
Jerrilyn V. Andrews

Allocated Budget: $273,245

Number of Pupils: 440

Cost Per Pupil: $621

Number of Schools: 11

Allocated Staff: 7 Teachers, 1 Resource Teacher, 1 Tutor, 13 Aides, 1 Guidance Counselor

Description: The Title-I program provided supplementary reading and mathematics instruction in three components: (a) eight regular non-public schools and Notre Dame Special/Vocational schools, (b) Mt. St. Michael, and (c) St. Joseph Center. Eligible students at the regular schools received daily instruction individually or in small groups in the areas of reading and mathematics. Students in grades one through six were deemed eligible if standardized test scores were at or below the 20th percentile on national norms. Kindergarten students were selected using a screening instrument developed by the Dallas Independent School District. Students residing in Dallas in an institution were eligible for supplemental instruction geared towards individual needs. These needs included reading, mathematics, and basic life skills. All Title-I students participated in counseling sessions during the school year.

Objective: Participants in grades one through six at the regular elementary campuses were expected to make gains of 1 to 10 percentile points in reading and mathematics achievement as measured by the Iowa Tests of Basic Skills. Kindergarten participants were expected to demonstrate achievement toward a standard norm of progress in reading readiness as measured by the Metropolitan Readiness Tests. Title-I participants in the ungraded, multi-aged program at Notre Dame were expected to demonstrate progress commensurate with each student's ability in meeting basic everyday needs. At Mt. St. Michael participants received mathematics instruction designed to bring achievement up to grade level. St. Joseph Center provided remedial tutorial assistance to enable students to perform more effectively in regular public schools.

Evaluation Results: The Title-I staff efficiently implemented the program as proposed. Kindergarten test scores were higher than the previous year. Achievement gains appeared to be made by students in grades one through six. Achievement objectives were partially met at every grade level. The staff at the institutions reported progress was made to meet the program objectives. No test scores were available because of the irregular nature of the test schedule and the length of residence at the institutions.

Interpretation: Partial attainment of performance objectives was achieved at every grade level. Teachers and students appeared to be enthusiastic about the program in general. The Title-I staff, principals and regular classroom teachers reported that the program brought positive outcomes to their campuses.

Report: Dyer, B., and Andrews, J. V. Evaluation of the Non-Public Title-I Schools, 1979-80: Catholic Diocese of Dallas, Mt. St. Michael and St. Joseph Center (T180-351-31-20). Dallas, Texas: Dallas Independent School District, Department of Research and Evaluation, September 1980.

Evaluation of the 1980 Title-I Summer Program: Catholic Diocese of Dallas

Evaluators:	Becca Dyer Jerrilyn V. Andrews		
Allocated Budget:	$69,386	**Number of Pupils:**	254
		Cost per Pupil:	$273
Number of Schools:	3		
Allocated Staff:	1 Coordinator, 3 Resource Teachers, 27 Compensatory Teachers, 3 Creative Arts Teachers, 3 Media Specialists and 1 Counselor		

Description: A summer enrichment program was provided at three campuses in the Diocese of Dallas. Participants from grades one through six received daily reading and mathematics instruction and related creative arts and library skills activities. Students from the Proyecto school, a non-graded school for limited- or non-English-speaking students, received instruction with an emphasis on learning the English language.

Objective: At the close of the six-week program, students were to sustain and/or extend reading and mathematics achievement gains made during the regular school year. For each student, two objectives in reading and two in mathematics were to be sustained and two new objectives in each subject area were to be learned. In addition, it was hoped that students would master two more objectives in each area. Objectives used were taken from the Dallas Independent School District baseline for each grade.

Evaluation Results: Title-I personnel efficiently implemented the program as proposed. Data indicated that eligible Title-I students did sustain nearly two objectives in reading and mathematics. Across schools, mean gain of new objectives mastered was nearly one objective in both areas. Not all students completely mastered the intended objectives, but many partially mastered them. Some additional objectives, not specified beforehand, were mastered and more additional objectives were partially mastered. As a whole, students achieved mastery on 1.5 objectives in mathematics and approximately 1 objective in reading. The range of total objectives mastered was 0 to 7.

Interpretation: Students sustained the two objectives that were specified in each subject area. In addition, students mastered 1.5 new objectives in mathematics and 1 new objective in reading. Some students mastered up to 7 new objectives. Teachers were enthusiastic about the program and felt it was beneficial to the students. More instruction could have been given to teachers to learn how to complete the progress form used for evaluation. Students may have mastered even more objectives during the summer program than data indicate. Some forms appeared to be incomplete, indicating that more objectives were taught and possibly mastered than were reported.

Report: Andrews, J.V., and Dyer, B. Evaluation of the 1980 Title-I Summer Program: Catholic Diocese of Dallas (T180-353-31-20). Dallas, Texas: Dallas Independent School District, Department of Research and Evaluation, September 1980.

T180-354

Evaluation of the 1980 Title-I Summer Program

Evaluators: Laurence Rudolph
Richard Ferguson

Allocated Budget: $261,858

Number of Pupils: 1,279

Cost per Pupil: $205

Number of Schools: 9

Allocated Staff: 1 Coordinator, 1 Creative Arts Supervisor, 1 Clerk, 128 Compensatory Teachers, 9 Media Specialists, 18 Creative Arts Teachers, 9 Resource Teachers, 9 Administrative Interns, 9 Clerks, 9 Parent Ombudsmen

Description: Eligible elementary students were taught reading, mathematics, and creative arts at one of nine summer schools. Students also received instruction from a media specialist to encourage them to read for pleasure and to use the resources of the media center. Students were drawn from the 56 Title-I schools for 1979-80. Students attended three hours of classes each day for six weeks. Classes varied in length from 30 to 90 minutes. Instruction was in small groups of 6 to 13 in reading and mathematics, 10 to 18 in media, and 12 to 25 in creative arts.

Objective: Students were to sustain and/or extend reading and mathematics achievement gains made during the regular school year. Two objectives in each subject were selected for each student to sustain, two to master partially, and two to master completely.

Evaluation Results: In reading, the median number of objectives mastered was .63, the median number of objectives partially mastered was 1.46, and the median number of objectives sustained was 1.89. In mathematics, the median number of objectives mastered was .97, the median number of objectives partially mastered was 1.42, and the median number of objectives sustained was 1.89.

Interpretation: The program's primary objective, for each student to sustain two baseline reading and mathematics objectives was achieved to a high degree. The program's secondary objectives were achieved to a moderate degree. In general, program plans were implemented according to the proposal, although there was variation among schools in the manner and degree of implementation. More students were served in the 1980 Summer Program than in 1979 due to better organization and recruitment.

Report: Rudolph, L. and Ferguson, R. Evaluation of the 1980 Title-I Summer Program (T180-354-81-20). Dallas, Texas: Dallas Independent School District, Department of Research and Evaluation, September 1980.

CE80-300

Evaluation of the 1979-80 State Compensatory Education Basic Skills Core K-6 Program

Evaluator: Gail B. Smith

Allocated Budget: $417,024 Number of Pupils: 670

Cost per Pupil: $622

Number of Schools: 17

Allocated Staff: 17 Teachers, 1 Reading Resource Teacher, 1 Motor Specialist, 1 Auditory Specialist, 1 Visual Specialist, 1 Media Specialist, 1 Secretary, 1 Resource Teacher/Facilitator, 1 Program Facilitator

Description: The SCE Basic Skills Core K-6 program offered instruction in piano or violin supplemented with instruction in general music, art, and language activities to selected Title-I eligible students in kindergarten through sixth grades. Students in kindergarten and first grade were scheduled to meet in small classes of five or six students for 30 minutes four times per week. Students in the second grade and above met in similar 30-minute, small classes three times per week and in an individual violin or piano tutorial 30-minute session one time per week. The full allocated staff was not hired. The positions for two specialists and one teacher were not filled.

Objective: Program objectives included both student assessment and assistance to students in the mastery of the following skills: (a) motor pocesses, (b) eye-hand coordination, (c) auditory analysis, and (d) visual analysis. Attainment of these objectives was measured through results of screening tests in basic skill areas and achievement of criterion gains in reading as measured for District Title-I students on the Metropolitan Readiness Tests (MRT) and the Reading Test of the Iowa Tests of Basic Skills (ITBS).

Evaluation Results: Screening tests for basic skills were administered to participating students by November 30, 1979, and a portion of these tests were administered again in April 1980. Significant mean gains were found for all students in kindergarten through grade three. Fourth grade mean gains were also significant with the exception of one test on directionality. No significant gains were recorded for fifth-grade students. Sixth-grade students made significant mean gains on three tests of drawing a person, manual dexterity, and body balance. The average performance on a test of visual-motor integration, given only in spring 1980, showed male students in kindergarten through third grade to be at expected age level. The average performance of female students appeared approximately one year behind expected age level in the first and third grades.

Participating students either met or exceeded the District criterion Title-I large city percentile gain levels for the ITBS Reading Test. The participating students, however, did not show significantly higher grade equivalent gains than a comparison group of Title-I students drawn from non-participating schools.

Interpretation: Program objectives for (a) screening student basic skills, (b) developing and implementing related activities in the classroom, and (c) student performance on the ITBS Reading Test were attained. In addition, survey results in participating schools reflected the need for careful planning for class scheduling and joint program teacher and homeroom teacher interaction.

Report: Smith, Gail B. Evaluation of the 1979-80 State Compensatory Education Basic Skills K-6 Program (CE80-300-31-01). Dallas, Texas: Dallas Independent School District, Department of Research and Evaluation, September 1980.

CE80-301

Evaluation of the 1979-80 State Compensatory Education Basic Communications Skills 7-12 Project

Evaluators: Stephen W. Hebbler
Duane L. Weckerly

Allocated Budget: $1,501,664

Number of Pupils: 3,450

Cost per Pupil: $435

Number of Schools: 36

Allocated Staff: 81 Teachers, 34 Aides

Description: The Basic Communication Skills 7-12 Project (BCSP) provided materials and a support staff (supplementary reading teachers and aides) for students reading below specified grade levels at 36 secondary schools.

Eligibility criteria varied according to student grade level. According to the BCSP proposal, seventh- and eighth-grade students who scored below 3.0 grade equivalents on the Iowa Tests of Basic Skills (ITBS) and ninth-grade students who scored below the 4.0 grade equivalent level on the ITBS were eligible for BCSP services. At the high school level, tenth-, eleventh-, and twelfth-grade students who scored below the 20th percentile on the ITBS or the Iowa Tests of Educational Development (ITED) were eligible for program services. In cases where an ITBS/ITED score was not available, or where these scores were felt to be invalid, other tests (e.g., the Gates-MacGinitie Reading Tests) were used as standardized eligibility criteria. Other eligibility criteria included teacher, parent, and counselor recommendations.

Objective: The objective of the BCSP was to improve the reading achievement level of the students who were served by the program.

Evaluation Results: Generally, the staff functioned as specified in the proposal. Class sizes exceeding the authorized number existed only at Cary. The majority of the teachers instructed only BCSP students. Exceptions to this were noted only at Comstock, Marsh, Rusk, Sequoyah, and Wilson. Major instructional emphasis in all BCSP classes was given to vocabulary development, reading comprehension, and consumer skills. Day-to-day instructional arrangements varied according to the specific needs and reading levels of the students.

The average grade equivalent gain on the ITBS Reading Tests for students in grades 7 and 8 was approximately six months while grade 9-11 students gained approximately four months. In both analysis groups there were relatively large standard deviations indicating a wide range of obtained gain scores.

When the expected percentile gain distribution (stated in the project proposal) was compared to the actual distribution of gains obtained by BCSP students, two major findings were noted. First, the percentages of students who exhibited no measurable gain from pretest to posttest was much greater than expected for both the grade 7-8 and grade 9 groups. This finding must be interpreted carefully, however, since the percentile gains stated in the proposal were very optimistic. Second, almost twice as many grade 7-8 students as expected achieved gains of 10 percentile points or more. This is especially significant since a 10-point percentile gain for students with a low pretest percentile rank (required for participation in the BCSP program) corresponded to a substantial increase in raw score on the test.

Interpretation: The BCSP was implemented as planned during the 1979-80 school year. The students participating in the project, who entered the program reading far below grade level, progressed at an average rate of four months (grades 9-11) to six months (grades 7 and 8) as measured by the ITBS.

Report: Hebbler, S. W. and Weckerly, D. L. Evaluation of the 1979-80 State Compensatory Education Basic Communications Skills 7-12 Project (CE80-301-31-01). Dallas, Texas: Dallas Independent School District, Department of Research and Evaluation, September 1980.

CE80-302

Evaluation of the 1979-80 State Compensatory Education Computer-Assisted Instructional (CAI) Mathematics Program

Evaluators: Debbie Patton
Stephen W. Hebbler

Allocated Budget: $150,000

Number of Pupils: 1,871

Cost Per Pupil: $80

Number of Schools: 22 middle schools, 20 high schools

Allocated Staff: None

Description: The Computer-Assisted Instructional (CAI) Mathematics Program provided an instructional vehicle that supplemented classroom instruction. Implementation of this project employed the classroom use of TRS-80 microcomputers and the Dallas Independent School District's CAI Mathematics Program tapes.

Objective: The CAI program was funded to increase student achievement on standardized and criterion-referenced mathematics tests. In addition, the Computer Mathematics teachers and students in 20 high schools were to adapt and/or develop microcomputer instructional activities focusing on the specific mathematics objectives measured by the Basic Objectives Assessment Test (BOAT). Thirty-one computers and existing DISD mathematics staff were employed to implement this part of the program.

Evaluation Results: The TRS-80 microcomputers and MCMP tapes were distributed to the participating schools beginning in December and continuing until mid-February. A total of 1871 target students were selected by the 46 participating teachers to work on the computers. Of these students, 1425 (76%) met the eligibility requirements (performing two or more grades below level on the Mathematics Baseline Objectives). Of the 34 teachers who returned questionnaires by February 8, 30 (88%) reported that they had received training on the operation of the microcomputer.

Twenty-seven of the 46 teachers (59%), representing 15 schools, kept individual record logs that monitored the computer activity of each participating student. A sample of students' record logs from 11 middle schools were used to calculate the average number of problems worked per month per sample student. The average ranged from 13.8 to 95.1 with an average of 55.5 problems per month. The average student-to-computer ratio for these 11 schools ranged from 5:1 to 41:1 with an average of 17:1.

The mean pretest grade equivalent scores (G.E.) on the Shaw-Hiehle Computation Test (SCHT) ranged from 3.07 to 4.94 with an average of 4.64. The mean posttest G.E. ranged from 3.76 to 6.08 with an average of 5.23. The mean gain per month in the program ranged from 0.46 months to 6.75 months with an average of 2.06. The average time between pretest and posttest ranged from 1 to 7.5 months with an average of 3.2 months. The gains made from pretest to posttest on the SCHT were statistically significant both for program students and for a group of control students, with the control groups exhibiting slightly higher gains. The control students were students who were eligible for the CAI program, but did not participate.

Thirteen (65%) of the 20 high schools chose one or more life skills objectives from the BOAT to work on, but programs were received from only eight (40%) of the 20 schools.

Interpretation: Most of the implementation problems that were encountered resulted from the fact that the computers were recieved late in the year. Several teachers commented that they found it hard to change classroom routines in "mid-stream." Some problems resulted from poor contact with project management, largely due to the fact that a full-time program manager was not hired for this project. Some teachers needed to be made more aware of the purpose and guidelines of the MCMP program.

Report: Patton, D., and Hebbler, S. W. Evaluation of the 1979-80 State Compensatory Education Computer Assisted Instructional (CAI) Mathematics Program (CE80-302-31-02). Dallas, Texas: Dallas Independent School District, Department of Research and Evaluation, July 1980.

Evaluation of the 1979-80 State Compensatory Education Project: Using a Direct Instruction Model to Teach Advanced Reading and Thinking to Underachieving Elementary and Middle School Students

Evaluator: Gail B. Smith

Allocated Budget: $137,000

Number of Pupils: 113

Cost per Pupil: $1,212

Number of Schools: 2

Allocated Staff: 1 Senior Instructional Analyst, 7 Assistant Instructional Analysts

Description: Instruction utilizing the SRA Corrective Reading Program in Decoding and Comprehension was provided to 57 fourth-grade students at Harllee and a selected group of 56 seventh-grade students at Hood. Class periods lasted approximately two hours and consisted of small groups which ranged from as few as 5 to as many as 12 students. The classes were characterized by quick-paced, oral teacher-student interaction and positive recognition for correct work and classroom participation. Project staff provided training for participating teachers in direct instruction techniques and monitored instructional procedures and student progress in all project classes. Direct instruction was implemented during the last seven months of the year at Harllee and for the last six months of the year at Hood.

Objective: The program's two objectives were: (a) to raise the achievement in reading and thinking skills of participating students to above grade level within two years, as measured by District standardized tests, and (b) to implement and document an instructional management system for supporting the direct instruction Corrective Reading Program.

Evaluation Results: Observations in classrooms and staff training sessions provided evidence of successful implementation of the instructional system after its start-up (October 15 at Harllee, November 15 at Hood). Draft documentation for teacher training in direct instruction techniques and procedures for supervising teachers was completed.

End-of-year grade equivalent scores for participating students (System-wide Testing, Form 8 of the ITBS, spring 1980) were 2.8 at Harllee and 4.5 at Hood. These scores were 2.0 and 3.3 years below grade level, respectively, at the time of testing.

The project staff performed calculations to assess student growth during the program interval (7 months at Harllee, 6 months at Hood) using a Form 5 ITBS that was administered to students immediately before instruction began. The posttest was the spring 1980 ITBS Form 5. The rates of gain reported by project personnel were 1.4 months for each month of instruction for Harllee students and 1.3 months for each month of instruction for Hood students. These rates of gain, though below the program's objective, are high for underachieving students such as those participating in the Direct Instruction Project.

Interpretation:

Since this was the first year of the program, the evaluation emphasis was on program implementation. The program was well implemented in terms of classroom procedures, monitoring of student progress, and training of teachers. Student gains on the ITBS were not presented because the System-wide Testing interval of spring 1979 to spring 1980 did not conform to the shorter program teaching span. Student gains will be presented in the 1980-81 project evaluation. In order for the average student to meet the project objective of reaching grade level after two years in the Direct Instruction Program, during 1980-81 Harllee students must have an average grade equivalent gain of 3.0 years and Hood students must have an average gain of 4.3 years. With instruction beginning earlier during the second year of the project (1980-81) and with the experience the students and staff will hve with the Corrective Reading curriculum, progress toward the student performance objective can be made during the entire year.

Report:

Smith, G. B. Evaluation of the 1979-80 State Compensatory Education Project: Using a Direct Instruction Model to Teach Advanced Reading and Thinking to Underachieving Elementary and Middle School Students (CE80-303-31-01). Dallas, Texas: Dallas Independent School District, Department of Research and Evaluation, September 1980

Evaluation of the 1979-80 State Compensatory Education Standard English as a Second Dialect for Speakers of a Non-Standard English Dialect Project

Evaluators:	Mark A. Goedecke Stephen W. Hebbler		
Allocated Budget:	$53,725	**Number of Pupils:**	Not Applicable
		Cost per Pupil:	Not Applicable
Number of Schools:	19		
Allocated Staff:	20 Teachers		

Description: The English as a Second Language for Speakers of a Non-Standard English Dialect (SESD) Project was designed to provide a core of teachers in the East Oak Cliff Subdistrict with the skills necessary for helping students whose primary dialect is other than standard English acquire proficiency in the use of standard English. The SESD project consisted of a series of seminars and work sessions presented by consultants defining language and dialectology. Information received from the seminars was to promote an understanding of the relationship between teachers' attitudes toward students' language and the effect of those attitudes on learning.

Objective: The specific objectives of the SESD project stated that the designated teachers would particpate in a series of seminars and work sessions. From these sessions the teachers would acquire knowledge of language and dialectology and its implication for learning. Using the skills learned in the work sessions, the teachers were to demonstrate their understanding of the SESD techniques by developing lessons and activities for the classroom. The teachers were also to demonstrate an understanding of the concept of language acceptance and its effect in the classroom.

Evaluation Results: Although the SESD project was not completely organized and implemented until February 1980, seven full-day training sessions were held with the consultants. The teachers were instructed in both theory and practical application of theory in the classroom. Lesson plans and a few examples of East Oak Cliff dialect were accumulated. Teacher attitudes toward the project were measured on a pre- and posttest basis. Results from 17 teachers who completed both parts of the attitude scale indicated an overall positive change of attitude regarding a student's home dialect. However, examination of individual items indicated that some teachers (27%) still found it difficult to accept primary dialects as legitimate languages.

Interpretation: Due to the late start of the project, the scope of project objectives was limited to completion of the training sessions. Most of the teachers agreed with the philosophy of language acceptance espoused by the consultants. However, there were some teachers who could not seem to agree with the idea of accepting primary dialect in the classroom. The impact of the training at the teachers' home schools and in the classrooms remains to be assessed in 1980-81. One of the original objectives of the program was the dissemination of the SESD skills to the faculty and staff of the teachers' home schools. The development of a specific curriculum for staff development sessions will be a necessary part of the 1980-81 SESD project.

Report: Goedecke, M. A. and Hebbler, S. W. *Evaluation of the 1979-80 State Compensatory Education Standard English as a Second Dialect for Speakers of a Non-Standard English Dialect Project* (CE80-304-31-16). Dallas, Texas: Dallas Independent School District, Department of Research and Evaluation, September 1980.

CE80-305

Evaluation of the State Compensatory Education (SCE) Reading Technology for Mastery Learning Project, 1979-80

Evaluators: Mark A. Goedecke
Stephen W. Hebbler

Allocated Budget: $312,000

Number of Pupils: 924

Cost per Pupil: $338

Number of Schools: 24

Allocated Staff: 8 Paraprofessionals

Description: The SCE Reading Technology for Mastery Learning (RTML) project was designed in two components. The first part of the RTML project involved the establishment of three New Century Reading Centers and seven Mastery Learning Centers in eight schools in the East Oak Cliff subdistrict. In each reading center, a teacher and an aide would provide an individualized structured reading program to meet the needs of eligible students.

The second facet of the RTML project involved the implementation of 16 Instructional Objectives Management Systems (IOMS) in each grade 4-6 school in the East Oak Cliff (EOC) Subdistrict. These systems contracted from Gulf Educational Systems, Inc. (GESI) were to provide an inventory of all relevant instructional materials in the schools and individual diagnoses and prescriptions for students' weaknesses.

Objective: The specific objectives of the RTML project were to establish reading centers to provide alternative learning strategies for teaching reading to participating pupils. Participation would lead to statistically greater reading performances as measured by reading achievement test scores. The IOMS were to provide a customized computer instructional management system in reading for teachers of language arts in grades four through six. The project would provide in-depth orientation and staff development by implementing training sessions that focus on diagnosis and prescription. The project would also provide orientation and training for parents to ensure their cooperation in program implementation.

Evaluation Results: The three New Century Reading Centers and five Mastery Learning Centers were installed in the eight EOC schools. The New Century Centers were installed and operational by December 1979 and the last Mastery Center began operation in February 1980. The computer management system, which is an integral part of the Mastery Centers, never overcame the logistical problem of receiving and delivering daily information to each center. The results of participation in the reading centers was generally inconclusive. The only group to show significantly different gain on grade equivalent scores over a comparison group were ninth-grade students in the Mastery Centers at the South Oak Cliff Ninth-Grade Center and F. D. Roosevelt High School. All of the teachers except one (88%) felt that participation in the RTML reading centers would have a positive impact on reading skills over the course of a school year.

The ICMS were never implemented in the 16 designated schools during 1979-80. The schools inventoried their instructional material and submitted those inventories to GESI. On May 19, 1980, students in the schools were pilot-tested to provide information for a May 26 staff development for principals explaining what services would be available in the 1980-81 school year.

Interpretation:

Due to the late start-up of the project, a definitive conclusion on the impact of participation in the structured reading centers is impossible. The Mastery Centers, even after becoming operational, did not function as they were designed with the daily computer analysis of data. All of the teachers stated that the high-interest, low-level reading materials were helpful in motivating students. It is recommended that the impact of the reading centers on students' reading achievement be assessed after the centers have operated as designed for the 1980-81 school year.

No interpretation of the impact of the ICMS on the 4-6 schools can be attempted at this time. Assessment of the value of the ICMS will have to be made when that part of the RTML project is completed.

Report:

Goedecke, M. A. and Hebbler, S. W. *Evaluation of the State Compensatory Education Reading Technology for Mastery Learning Project, 1979-80* (CE60-305-31-01). Dallas, Texas: Dallas Independent School District, Department of Research and Evaluation, September 1980.

CE80-306

Evaluation of the 1979-80 State Compensatory Education Project—An Aesthetic Instructional Program: Implications for Reading and Mathematics

Evaluator: Stephen W. Hebbler

Allocated Budget: $64,000

Number of Pupils: 200

Cost per Pupil: $320

Number of Schools: 5

Allocated Staff: 5 Resident Artists

Description: The Aesthetic Instructional Program (AIP) was designed to instruct students in several areas of aesthetics--dance/creative movement, dramatic arts/choral speaking, choral music, and visual arts. The project included approximately 200 students in grades K-12 in 5 EOC schools.

Objective: The major objectives of the AIP were to assemble a staff of knowledgeable, capable professionals (resident artists) and to provide instruction in several areas of aesthetics focusing on skills and concepts that area correlated with achievement in reading and mathematics. Additionally, the program was to help develop students' abilities to exhibit self-confidence and poise and to provide the students with a culminating experience for demonstrating the skills acquired during the program.

Evaluation Results: Due to a very late project start-up date, none of the original project objectives (such as instructional process and student achievement) were met during the months September 1979 through January 1980. However, a major thrust was undertaken during January to get the program underway.

Five artists-in-residence were identified during the month of February 1980 and began working with students in the target schools during March. Each artist worked with two classes twice a week. Interviews with the instructors indicated that they were generally satisfied with the concept of the AIP and felt that the students would benefit from the program. They were somewhat skeptical about the impact the program might have on students' reading and mathematics achievement, especially since the program had begun so late in the year. Two of the teachers stated that the lack of materials (most had been ordered but had not arrived) had hindered their instruction. Two of the artists indicated that adapting to working with school-age children (rather than with adults or peers in the art community) had taken longer than they had expected. The typical problems involved in working in an educational program (requisitions, securing signatures, schedule changes, last-minute changes in room allocations, etc.) were also new to some of the artists.

A wide range of instructional activities were engaged in by AIP students. The evaluation staff observed groups of students participating in choral and vocal music instruction, creative movement, preparation for a dramatic presentation, and preparation of drawings and paintings for display. The students, as well as the artist, seemed to be interested in the activities, although some of the kindergarten and first-grade students needed some prompting to remain attentive. All of the activities were in preparation for a performance or display at the project culminating exercise which was held on May 22. Several of the teachers stated that the pressure to get the students ready for the culminating exercises made it necessary for them to push the students for a product rather than allowing them to help the students explore various aspects of the visual and performing arts. They were hopeful that a longer project period during the 1980-81 school year would give them time for more creative work with the students.

Interpretation: The AIP was implemented only during the second half of the 1979-80 school year. During that period, however, the instructional activities were carried out as proposed. The short instructional period precluded any meaningful analysis of student achievement that might be attributable to the project.

Report: Hebbler, S. W. Evaluation of the 1979-80 State Compensatory Education Project--An Aesthetic Instructional Program: Implications for Reading and Mathematics (CE80-306-31-20). Dallas, Texas: Dallas Independent School District, Department of Research and Evaluation, September 1980.

Evaluation of the 1979-80 State Compensatory Education Summer School Project

Evaluator: Stephen W. Hebbler

Allocated Budget: $150,000

Number of Pupils: 300

Cost per Pupil: $500

Number of Schools: 19

Allocated Staff: 80 Teachers, 9 Supervisors

Description: The State Compensatory Education Summer School Project was designed as a high intensity course of study providing instruction in reading and mathematics for students completing third or sixth grade in 1979-80 and scoring 50% or less on the Basic Objectives Assessment Test (BOAT). The project used the Science Research Associates (SRA) Corrective Reading and Corrective Mathematics programs and was conducted during the regular DISD summer school period. Approximately 300 students and 85 teachers participated in the program.

Objective: The objective of the summer school project was to help students remediate achievement deficiencies in the areas of reading and mathematics.

Evaluation Results: Observations conducted by evaluation personnel revealed teachers and students engaged in reading and mathematics instruction characterized by a very high level of interaction and student involvement. Since the students were actively participating in the classroom activities, there were no discipline problems. Most of the teachers seemed comfortable with and knowledgeable about the instructional method being employed. The student-to-teacher ratios in the summer school classrooms were conducive to student learning and allowed the teachers, who were new to the direct instruction method of teaching, to gain valuable experience with small groups of students. The student-to-teacher ratios varied from 1:2 to 1:5, with a typical classroom averaging 3 or 4 students. Observations indicated that the summer school teacher supervisors worked closely with the classroom teachers and visited their classrooms at least twice each week.

Results of a survey administered to teachers during the last week of summer school (75 of 85 teachers returned completed surveys) revealed that the majority (77%) felt that direct instruction was an excellent method for teaching reading. Approximately 28% felt that direct instruction was an excellent method for teaching mathematics while 39% rated it as a good method. All of the teachers indicated that their students liked the direct instruction approach in reading; 84% said the students liked it in mathematics. Concerning the 20-hour pre-service training they had received in direct instruction, a majority of the teachers gave the sessions excellent ratings for comprehensiveness (71%), clarity (75%), pacing (53%), organization (67%), and usefulness (68%). They also considered the supervision they received during the summer school session to have been excellent in terms of promptness (91%), clarity (87%), and usefulness (84%).

The only item which received a large number of negative ratings by the teachers concerned conditions in their classrooms. Specifically, teachers indicated that the temperature in their classrooms made instruction very difficult (43%) or slightly difficult (27%). Observations made by the evaluators confirmed the problem. In several of the schools the air conditioning systems were completely out of service during most or all of the summer school session. The problem was so acute that two of the five schools had to suspend classes for one day each.

Student progress was assessed in terms of lessons completed at mastery in the Corrective Reading and Corrective Mathematics Programs. The SCE summer school students averaged 1.5 lessons per day in reading (the average is approximately one lesson per day) and .8 lessons in mathematics. The Corrective Mathematics program is still in the process of preparation by SRA.

Interpretation: The program was implemented as planned. Students received instruction in reading and mathematics during the regular DISD summer term. Students progressed at a greater than average rate through the SRA Corrective Reading program.

Report: Hebbler, S. W. Evaluation of the 1979-80 State Compensatory Education Summer School Project (CE80-307-31-30), Dallas, Texas: Dallas Independent School District, Department of Research and Evaluation, September 1980.

CE80-308

Evaluation of the 1979-80 State Compensatory Education Evaluation Component

Evaluator: Stephen W. Hebbler

Allocated Budget: $108,997

Number of Pupils: Not Applicable

Cost per Pupil: Not Applicable

Number of Schools: Not Applicable

Allocated Staff: 1 Senior Programmer, 1 Evaluator, 3 Assistant Evaluators, 1 Statistical Technician, 1 Data Specialist

Description: The SCE evaluation component was designed to provide the Dallas Independent School District and the Texas Education Agency with specific information needed to determine the implementation, ongoing processes, and final outcomes of each project funded by SCE. In addition, the evaluation component was to provide process information to SCE project managers throughout the year. Formal products of the evaluation component included planning documents, evaluation instruments, interim reports and memoranda, as well as a final evaluation report for each SCE project.

Objective: The major objective of the evaluation component was to conduct an accurate and unbiased assessment of each project funded by SCE during 1979-80.

Evaluation Results: A wide variety of evaluation activities was engaged in by the SCE evaluation staff. Because of the diversity in the characteristics (instructional emphasis, grade levels, staffing arrangements, etc.) of the funded projects, the particular tasks and activities varied widely from project to project. The major activities were generally consistent with the formal evaluation plans. However, if major changes in project objectives or activities occurred during the year, the evaluation design was adapted to reflect the project as it was actually being implemented. One common reason for slight variations in some of the analyses appearing in the formal evaluation plans was a change in the ITBS test editions used by System-wide Testing. Many of the evaluation reports relied heavily on achievement data obtained through System-wide Testing. The change in test edition and the corresponding score conversions generated an unknown error factor which rendered the test data (especially achievement gains) difficult to interpret.

The ultimate impact of any program evaluation resides in the constructive use of the findings and results by the audience (report recipients). The major visible products of the evaluation component were the documents which were produced to convey the information about evaluations of the projects. For each project funded under SCE during 1979-80, the following documents were prepared and are on file with the manager of the evaluation component.

- Evaluation Overview
- Formal Evaluation Plan
- Interim Evaluation Memoranda
- Final Evaluation Report

Most of the information contained in the above documents was presented to project personnel either before or immediately after the documents were completed.

Interpretation: An evaluation was conducted for each of the projects funded by SCE during 1979-80. For each project, a formal evaluation plan and a final evaluation report were prepared.

Report: Hebbler, S. W. Evaluation of the 1979-80 State Compensatory Education Evaluation Component (CE80-308-31-05). Dallas, Texas: Dallas Independent School District, Department of Research and Evaluation, September 1980.

EE80-310

Evaluation of the 1979-80 Emergency School Aid Act (ESAA) Basic Project, Grades 4-6

Evaluators: Gary L. Elliott
Wayne R. Murray

Allocated Budget: $660,086

Number of Pupils: 4,245

Cost per Pupil: $155

Number of Schools: 29

Allocated Staff: 29 Resource Teachers, 29 Teacher Aides

Description: The ESAA Basic Project for students in grades four, five and six provided remedial mathematics instruction in the mathematics laboratory of 27 grade 4-6 schools impacted by the court-ordered desegregation plan. Students were eligible for this program if they were achieving below grade level placement and were being bused for desegregation purposes. The students went to the ESAA mathematics laboratory during part of their regular mathematics class.

Objective: The students in this program were to increase their mathematics skills so that their posttest scores would be higher than projected without this program. Statistically significant differences were expected between pretest and posttest as well as actual posttest and projected posttest scores. Projected posttest scores were obtained by calculating average yearly growth in grade equivalent points and adding this average to the pretest score. Students were then expected to obtain a posttest score higher than the projected posttest score.

Evaluation Results: In general, the project seemed to be implemented as designed. Performance on the Mathematics Test of the Iowa Tests of Basic Skills (ITBS) was used to monitor students' progress. Form 5 of the ITBS was administered in the spring of 1979 as a pretest, and Form 8 was administered in the spring of 1980 as a posttest. Mean grade-equivalent pretest scores for students in grades 4, 5, and 6 were 2.7, 3.1, and 3.7, respectively. Corresponding posttest scores were 3.3, 4.1, and 4.8.

At all three grade levels, the pretest-to-posttest gains were statistically significant. Also, actual posttest scores in grades 5 and 6 were greater than projected posttest scores. Therefore, the objective of the project was met for these two grades. This objective was not met for students in grade 4.

Interpretation:

Attainment of the performance objectives for the fifth and sixth graders was a favorable outcome for the project. A conservative approach would urge caution in the interpretation of the data because of the many sources of invalidity in the one-group (i.e., no control group) pretest - posttest design and the uncertainty of the comparability of the different forms of the test used in the evaluation.

Report:

Elliott, G. L. and Murray, W. R. Evaluation of the Emergency School Aid Act, (ESAA) Basic Project, Grades 4-6, 1979-80 (EE80-310-31-20). Dallas, Texas: Dallas Independent School District, Department of Research and Evaluation, September 1980.

Evaluation of the 1979-80 Emergency School Aid Act (ESAA) Basic Project, Grade 7-8 Schools

Evaluators:	Gary L. Elliott Wayne R. Murray		
Allocated Budget:	$430,078	Number of Pupils:	5,389
		Cost per Pupil:	$80
Number of Schools:	17		
Allocated Staff:	17 Resource Teachers, 17 Teacher Aides		

Description: The ESAA Basic Project for Middle Schools offered remedial mathematics instruction for students in grades seven and eight. Students who were below grade level and were bused (in schools where busing was court-ordered for desegregation) were served in a mathematics laboratory in their school during their regular mathematics class. Seventeen middle schools participated in the program.

Objective: The overall objective of this program was for students to improve their mathematics skills more than would have been expected without this program. Statistically significant differences were expected between students' pretest and posttest scores as well as actual posttest and projected posttest scores. Projected posttest scores were obtained by calculating average yearly growth in grade equivalent points and adding this average to the pretest score. Students were then expected to obtain a posttest score higher than the projected posttest score.

Evaluation Results: The project was implemented in all 17 schools as specified in the proposal. Performance on the Mathematics Test of the Iowa Tests of Basic Skills was used to monitor students' progress. Form 5 of the ITBS was administered in the spring of 1979 as a pretest, and Form 8 was administered in the spring of 1980 as a posttest. Mean grade-equivalent pretest scores for students in grades 7 and 8 were 4.7 and 5.0, respectively. Corresponding posttest scores were 5.6 and 6.1. At both grade levels the pretest-to-posttest gains were statistically significant. Also, actual posttest scores at both grade levels were greater than projected posttest scores. Therefore, the objectives of the project were attained.

Interpretation: The performance objectives were attained in this program but a conservative approach is urged because of the many possible sources of invalidity in the one-group (i.e., no control group) pretest-posttest design. In addition, the comparability of the two different forms of the test, used respectively for pretest and posttest, is uncertain.

Report: Elliott, G. L. and Murray, W. R. *Evaluation of the Emergency School Aid Act (ESAA) Basic Project, Grades 7-8, 1979-80* (EE80-311-31-02). Dallas, Texas: Dallas Independent School District, Department of Research and Evaluation, September 1980.

Evaluation of the 1979-80 Emergency School Aid Act (ESAA) Basic Project, Magnet School Reading Program

Evaluators:	John H. Miller Wayne R. Murray		
Allocated Budget:	$137, 332	Number of Students:	393
		Cost per Pupil:	$349
Number of Schools:	6		
Allocated Staff:	6 Resource Teachers, 6 Teacher Aides		

Description: The ESAA Basic Project in the magnet schools was to provide a supplemental reading program with materials and support staff (a resource teacher and an aide) in each of the six schools. The program was organized to best serve those students at each school. Each school had a reading laboratory for individualized instruction, and all schools had several supplementary reading classes which met daily.

The resource teachers provided supplemental reading instruction each day and also taught life skills to the students. Students were in grades 9 through 11.

Objective: Students were to make gains in reading as measured by scores on the Tests of Achievement and Proficiency (TAP) and the Basic Objectives Assessment Test (BOAT).

Evaluation Results: All staff positions, six resource teachers and six ESAA-funded aides, were filled by September 1979. Generally, the staff functioned as proposed. In addition to reading classes, the resource teacher at the High School for the Health Professions instructed English classes at the school.

Approximately 18% of the magnet school reading students passed the BOAT (i.e., scored at least 70% correct). The percent of students passing ranged from 8.3% at the Transportation Institute to 25.6% at the Business Management Center.

Performance on the Tests of Achievement and Proficiency (TAP) was for the most part consistent across grades within a school. However, there was considerable variability between schools. The median percentiles ranged from 1.4 (grade 9 at Transportation Magnet) to 27.0 (grade 11 at the Magnet Center for Public Services: Government and Law).

Interpretation: Because of changes in the System-Wide Testing program it was not possible to examine pretest-to-posttest changes in the students' reading comprehension scores. However, reading achievement as measured by the TAP in early May 1980 was low.

The observed variability in test scores across schools is most likely a function of the type of student attracted to the school and the selection criteria for inclusion in the ESAA reading program.

Report: Miller, J. H. and Murray, W. R. Evaluation of the 1979-80 Emergency School Aid Act (ESAA) Basic Project, Magnet School Reading Program (EE80-312-31-01). Dallas, Texas: Dallas Independent School District, Department of Research and Evaluation, September 1980.

EE80-313

Evaluation of the 1979-80 Emergency School Aid Act (ESAA) Basic Project, Human Relations and Guidance

Evaluators: John H. Miller
Wayne R. Murray

Allocated Budget: $502,904 **Number of Pupils:** Not Applicable

Cost per Pupil: Not Applicable

Number of Schools: 27

Allocated Staff: 27 Human Relations and Guidance Counselors

Description: Each of the 27 grade 4-6 ESAA schools was assigned an ESAA counselor. Counselors were advised by Campus Planning Teams composed of the counselors, school principals, school teachers, and parents. Counselors performed needs assessments and developed plans to meet those needs. Counseling activities included student, parent, and teacher counseling sessions; classroom discussions; and parent and teacher workshops.

Objective: This component was designed to provide guidance and counseling services for parents, teachers, and students in grades 4 through 6 involved in the desegregation process in 27 Dallas Independent School District intermediate schools.

Evaluation Results: Campus Planning Teams were operating as planned by the end of September 1979. Counseling programs were implemented by December 1, 1979, the proposed completion date for this activity. Individual campus guidance plans were developed at every school, subsequent to needs assessments. Monthly staff development meetings were conducted by the program manager and attended by the counselors. When asked about their attitudes toward the program, all 24 counselors who responded to a questionnaire stated that the main strength of the program was the cooperation and support of faculty members and parents.

Counselors also indicated weaknesses they felt affected the program. Some of these weaknesses were:

1. Not enough time for guidance activities and planning due to testing and other central office related duties (N=4 counselors).
2. Not enough parental and/or community involvement (N=4).
3. Too many students for one counselor (N=3).
4. Lack of space and finances (N=2).
5. Not enough interaction between counselors (N=2).

Interpretation: The support of the program by teachers and parents indicated that the program was considered an important aspect of the total school program.

Report: Miller, J. H. and Murray, W. R. Evaluation of the 1979-80 Emergency School Aid Act (ESAA) Basic Project, Human Relations and Guidance (EE80-313-31-05). Dallas, Texas: Dallas Independent School District, September 1980.

EE80-314

Evaluation of the 1979-80 Emergency School Aid Act (ESAA) Basic Project, Administrative Services

Evaluators: John H. Miller
Wayne R. Murray

Allocated Budget: $111, 269 **Number of Pupils:** Not Applicable

Cost per Pupil: Not Applicable

Number of Schools: Not Applicable

Allocated Staff: 1 Director, 1 Coordinator, 1 Analyst, 1 Accountant, 1 Secretary, 1 Clerk-typist

Description: The staff of this component facilitated and supervised the implementation of all ESAA components. A management plan was developed, and was followed throughout the year.

Objective: This project was designed to provide continuous assistance to project personnel in the planning, implementation, and management of all ESAA components.

Evaluation Results: All program managers indicated that the Administrative Team provided excellent assistance in all of the areas required. Each had sought assistance or consultation on numerous occasions and each indicated that the assistance provided was more than adequate. In addition, the Administrative Team attempted to include students, teachers, and parents in the ESAA Projects' decision-making process. The acting director of the ESAA Program stated that this objective was attained through the District-wide Student Advisory Committee and the District-wide Advisory Committee. The Administrative Team solicited input during proposal writing stages and contacted parents and teachers to attend special meetings. Further, after a regularly scheduled Advisory Committee meeting a public hearing was held at the

School Administration Building. The purpose of the meeting was to discuss the proposed ESAA Program for the 1980-81 school year. However, no persons other than the regular Advisory Committee members and Program Managers attended, and the meeting was adjourned without public comment.

Interpretation: The administrative staff of ESAA appeared to carry out its duties in an acceptable and professional manner.

Report: Miller, J. H. and Murray, W. R. Evaluation of the 1979-80 Emergency School Aid Act (ESAA) Basic Project, Administrative Services (EE80-314-31-05). Dallas, Texas: Dallas Independent School District, Department of Research and Evaluation, September 1980.

Evaluation of the 1979-80
Emergency School Aid Act (ESAA)
Pilot Project

Evaluators:	John H. Miller Wayne R. Murray		
Allocated Budget:	1,019,758	Number of Pupils:	2,016
		Cost per Pupil:	$505
Number of Schools:	21		
Allocated Staff:	12 Resource Teachers, 20 Supplementary Teachers, 34 Teacher Aides, 1 Coordinator, 5 Facilitators, 2 Clerks, 1 Curriculum Writer, 1 Evaluator		

Description: This ESAA sponsored reading program was implemented in 20 East Oak Cliff Subdistrict schools: 12 intermediate schools, 4 middle schools, and 4 high schools. Personnel developed student instructional plans, maintained records of student progress, and developed modules and strategies for vocabulary development. They also instructed students in reading comprehension and in vocabulary development. In the high schools, students also received life skills training. Twelve staff development sessions for all personnel were held throughout the year.

The project was to include a community involvement program. However, because of a budget change, this part of the program was not implemented.

Objective: Students were to show academic improvement in reading comprehension as measured by scores on the Iowa Tests of Basic Skills (ITBS) and the Tests of Achievement and Proficiency (TAP).

Evaluation Results: In grades four through eight Form 5 of the ITBS was administered in the spring of 1979 as a pretest, and Form 8 was administered in the spring of 1980 as a posttest. ESAA students demonstrated gains from pretest to posttest on the Reading Comprehension Test of the ITBS. In grades five through eight, these gains were higher than the expected had there been no supplementary ESAA program.

Mean grade equivalent pretest scores for participating students were: grade 4, 2.5; grade 5, 3.1; grade 6, 3.7; grade 7, 3.6; and grade 8, 4.2. Corresponding posttest scores were: grade 4, 3.0; grade 5, 4.0; grade 6, 4.7; grade 7, 4.4; and grade 8, 5.0.

On the spring 1980 administration of the TAP, students in grades nine through eleven at the four secondary schools had mean percentile ranks ranging from 1.9 to 10.5.

Interpretation:

Except for the community involvement program, the Pilot Project was, in general, implemented as planned. Student achievement gains in reading in grades 5 through 8 were larger than indicated, but reading achievement still lagged behind actual grade placement. Care should be exercised in interpreting these results, however, because the comparability of the different forms of the pre- and posttests is uncertain. Student achievement in reading comprehension was unimpressive in grades 9 through 11.

Report:

Miller, J. H. and Murray, W. R. Evaluation of the 1979-80 Emergency School Aid Act (ESAA) Pilot Project (EE80-315-31-20). Dallas, Texas: Dallas Independent School District, Department of Research and Evaluation, September 1980.

Evaluation of the Emergency School Aid Act (ESAA) Basic Project, Special Student Concerns

Evaluators:	John H. Miller Wayne R. Murray		
Allocated Budget:	$128,737	Number of Pupils:	Not Applicable
		Cost per Pupil:	Not Applicable
Number of Schools:	27		
Allocated Staff:	3 Facilitators		

Description: Seven-member teams composed of teachers, administrators, and parents were chosen from each of the 27 grade 4-6 schools impacted by court-ordered desegregation. In retreat settings, each team participated in a one-day workshop pertaining to alternative strategies of discipline.

Objective: The purposes of the program were to present and demonstrate the use of resource materials available at the Intervention Resource Center that pertained to alternative strategies of discipline and to serve intervention teams, faculties, and/or parents at participating grade 4-6 schools.

Evaluation Results: Questionnaires were sent to the Intervention Team school building principals in the 27 participating grade 4-6 schools. Of that number, 23 (85%) were returned. Eighty-seven percent (20 of 23) indicated that the project staff provided training in the use of alternative strategies of discipline. Nine percent (2 of 23) indicated that their team was not provided training and four percent (1 of 23) did not respond.

Eighteen (78%) respondents indicated that they attended an intensive one-day seminar geared toward the 4-6 building principals and/or principals' designees. Twenty-two percent indicated they did not attend.

Eighteen principals (78%) indicated that the seven-member team had been selected to participate in the school-based training. Twenty-two percent stated that the teams had not been selected.

Eighty-three percent (N=19) of the respondents indicated that technical assistance was provided by project staff and trainers to the school-based team. One (4%) respondent indicated no technical assistance had been given, and three respondents (13%) did not answer this question.

Interpretation:

The program appeared to be implemented as planned in a majority of the grade 4-6 schools impacted by the court-ordered desegregation plan.

Inspection of evaluation results obtained by project managers showed that workshop participants felt that the workshops were useful to themselves and their schools.

Report:

Miller, J. H. and Murray, W. R. Evaluation of the 1979-80 Emergency School Aid Act (ESAA) Basic Project, Special Student Concerns (EE80-316-31-13). Dallas, Texas: Dallas Independent School District, Department of Research and Evaluation, September 1980.

EE80-317

Evaluation of the 1979-80 Emergency School Aid Act (ESAA) Basic Project, Community Relations

Evaluators: John H. Miller
Wayne R. Murray

Allocated Budget: $502,523

Number of Pupils: Not Applicable

Cost per Pupil: Not Applicable

Number of Schools: 27

Allocated Staff: 27 Community Specialists, 1 Coordinator, 1 Secretary

Description: Community specialists implemented parenting programs such as parenting workshops and Parent Teacher Association presentations. Also, they obtained volunteers in their communities to work in the schools as tutors, office clerks, nursing assistants, and lunchroom and hall monitors.

Objective: The purpose of this project was to keep parents and interested citizens better informed and aware of school programs and alternatives, and to increase the involvement of parents and interested citizens in the educational process.

Evaluation Results: Needs assessments were performed at each school at the beginning of the school year. Approximately 2,294 volunteers were obtained and assigned various tasks in the schools. They worked about 62,978 total hours, or an average of 27 hours per volunteer. During the 1978-79 school year 2,178 volunteers worked a total of 66,164 hours. It is interesting to note that while the total number of volunteers increased during the past two years, the actual number of volunteer hours decreased. Community specialists also contacted parents at home about situations adversely affecting students' learning.

Interpretation: Overall, the project was implemented as planned and the goals of the program were attained.

Report: Miller, J. H. and Murray, W. R. *Evaluation of the 1979-80 Emergency School Aid Act (ESAA) Basic Project, Community Relations* (EE80-317-31-11). Dallas, Texas: Dallas Independent School District, Department of Research and Evaluation, September 1980.

EE80-318

Evaluation of the Emergency School Aid Act (ESAA) Special Compensatory Project, 1979-80

Evaluators: Gary L. Elliott
Wayne R. Murray

Allocated Budget: $91,533 **Number of Pupils:** 257

Cost per Pupil: $356

Number of Schools: 4

Allocated Staff: 4 Resource Teachers

Description: The ESAA Special Compensatory Project offered remedial mathematics instruction for fifth- and sixth-grade students who were Title-I eligible but, because of busing for desegregation, attended non-Title-I schools. The Mathematics for Individual Achievement program was to be used througout the project period.

Objective: The overall objective was to develop the mathematics skills of the students who were served at a faster rate than would have been expected if the students were not in the program. Specifically, the students were to exhibit a significant gain on the Mathematics Test of the Iowa Tests of Basic Skills (ITBS) from pretest to posttest and 60% of the students were to show higher posttest scores than would have been expected under a non-treatment condition.

Evaluation Results: One of the schools did not use the Mathematics for Individual Achievement Program. Otherwise, the project seemed to be implemented as designed.

Performance on the Mathematics Test of the ITBS was used to monitor students' progress. Form 5 of the ITBS was administered in the spring of 1979 as a pretest, and Form 8 was administered in the spring of 1980 as a posttest. Mean grade-equivalent pretest scores for students in grades 5 and 6 were 2.9 and 3.3, respectively. Corresponding posttest scores were 3.8 and 4.6. Both of the objectives related to student performance were achieved with both grades showing statistically significant gains from pretest to posttest and 75% of the students showing higher-than-projected posttest scores.

Interpretation: The results of the evaluation were favorable to the program. However the reader is urged to use caution because of the possible sources of invalidity in the one-group (i.e., no control group) pretest-posttest design used in this evaluation. In addition, caution is also urged because different forms of the ITBS were used for the pretest and posttest.

Report: Elliott, G. L. and Murray, W. R. Evaluaton of the Emergency School Aid Act (ESAA) Special Compensatory Project, 1979-80 (EE80-318-31-02). Dallas, Texas: Dallas Independent School District, Department of Research and Evaluation, September, 1980.

EE80-319

Evaluation of the 1979-80 Emergency School Aid Act (ESAA) Basic Project, Bilingual Component

Evaluators:	Gary L. Elliott Wayne R. Murray		
Allocated Budget:	$194,306	**Number of Pupils:**	516
		Cost per Pupil:	$377
Number of Schools:	12		
Allocated Staff:	8 Resource Teachers, 8 Teacher Aides		

Description: The ESAA Bilingual Component provided supplementary bilingual instruction in the areas of language arts, mathematics, social studies, and science to students who were of limited English proficiency. Being bused or Spanish-language dominant were not requirements to be served by this program.

Objective: The program objectives were to develop the bilingual capabilities and raise the level of achievement of all students in the program. To promote understanding and appreciation of the multicultural values and traditions of the ethnic groups was also a program objective. The students were to exhibit gains on the Inter-American Test of General Ability with 60% of the students showing a 20% gain and the remaining 40% of the students demonstrating a 10% gain from pretest to posttest.

Evaluation Results: Some deviations from the proposal relative to implementation procedures and some staffing problems were noted. Not all resource teachers and aides were performing activities as specified in the proposal. Also, two of the eight allocated aide positions were not filled.

Student's performance on the Inter-American Tests did not meet the objectives stated in the proposal. The proposed 20% pretest-to-posttest gain for 60% of the students was actually achieved by only 22.7% of the students.

Interpretation: It is the opinion of the evaluators that the achievement objectives for this program were unrealistic. Although the achievement goals were not met, improvement in the posttest scores was observed. A conservative approach would be to urge caution in the interpretation of the test scores because of the lack of norms for the test and the many sources of invalidity inherent in the one-group (i.e., no control group) pretest-posttest design.

Report: Elliott, G. L. and Murray, W. R. Evaluation of the Emergency School Aid Act (ESAA) Basic Project, Bilingual Component, 1979-80 (EE80-319-31-09). Dallas, Texas: Dallas Independent School District, Department of Research and Evaluation, September, 1980

EE80-320

Evaluation of the 1979-80 Emergency School Aid Act (ESAA) Program in the Private Non-Profit Schools

Evaluators: John H. Miller
Wayne R. Murray

Allocated Budget: Funds distributed through other ESAA projects

Number of Pupils: 483

Cost per Pupil: Not Applicable

Number of Schools: 11

Allocated Staff: 3 Reading Resource Teachers, 3 Mathematics Resource Teachers, 9 Teacher Aides

Description: For the 1979-80 school year, the Emergency School Aid Act (ESAA), as part of the Basic Grant and Pilot Grant, provided funds to the Catholic Diocese of Dallas. The program was designed to provide remedial assistance in reading and mathematics to students functioning below grade placement. There were 11 grade 4-8 private non-profit (PNP) schools obtaining funds through these ESAA Grants. There were three reading resource teachers and three mathematics resource teachers involved in implementing the supplemental reading and mathematics programs. The remedial assistance was provided in a tutoring program using teacher aides and the resource teachers to improve the reading and mathematics skills of the participating students.

Objective: Students in this program were to increase their mathematics and reading skills so that their posttest scores would be higher than projected without this program. Statistically significant differences were expected between pretest and posttest as well as actual posttest and projected posttest scores. Projected posttest scores were obtained by calculating average yearly growth in grade equivalent points and adding this to the pretest score. Students were then expected to obtain a posttest score higher than the projected posttest score.

Evaluation Results:

Form 5 of the Iowa Tests of Basic Skills (ITBS) was administered in the spring of 1979 as a pretest, and Form 8 was administered in the spring of 1980 as a posttest.

Most students at all grade levels improved in reading and mathematics achievement as demonstrated by gains from mean pretest scores to mean posttest scores on the Reading Comprehension and Mathematics Tests of the ITBS. Mean posttest scores were within 0.7 grade equivalents of actual grade placement for all grades. Also, in grades 4, 5, and 8 in reading comprehension and in all grades (grades 4 through 8) in mathematics students' actual posttest scores were statistically significantly higher than projected posttest scores.

Interpretation:

Overall, the program was implemented as planned. Also, ITBS gains showed successful program impact. However, caution is urged in interpreting ITBS gains, since, even though statistical techniques were employed to permit comparison across different forms of the ITBS, the actual comparability of the pretest and posttest used in the evaluation is uncertain.

Report:

Miller, J. H. and Murray, W. R. Evaluation of the 1979-80 Emergency School Aid Act (ESAA) Program in the Private Non-Profit Schools (EE80-320-31-20). Dallas, Texas: Dallas Independent School District, Department of Research and Evaluation, September, 1980.

EE80-329

Evaluation of the 1979-80 Emergency School Aid Act (ESAA) Bilingual Education Project

Evaluators: Gary L. Elliott
Wayne R. Murray

Allocated Budget: $487,746

Number of Pupils: 2,093

Cost per Pupil: $233

Number of Schools: 17

Allocated Staff: 16 Resource Teachers, 23 Teacher Aides, 1 Senior Analyst, 1 Community Specialist, 1 Secretary, 1 Assistant Evaluator

Description: The ESAA Bilingual Project provided supplementary bilingual instruction in the areas of language arts, mathematics, social studies, and science. Students were served by this program if they were of limited English proficiency. Being bused or Spanish-language dominant were not requirements for participation in this program.

Objective: The program's overall objectives included (a) to develop bilingual language capabilities and raise the level of achievement of all students in the program, (b) to promote understanding and appreciation of the cultural values and traditions of all ethnic groups, (c) to increase skills of all staff participating in the project and (d) to involve community and parents in the program.

The students were expected to show gains in general ability scores as measured by the Inter-American Series of Tests. Of those being served, 60% were expected to gain 20% and the remaining 40% of the students were expected to gain 10% from pretest to posttest.

Evaluation Results: Some deviations from the proposal relative to implementation procedures and some staffing problems were noted. Because of a lack of certified bilingual personnel some schools were not able to provide basic instruction in the student's dominant language. Also, not all resource teachers and aides performed all duties listed in the proposal.

The performance of the students on the Inter-American Tests did not meet the objectives stated in the proposal. The proposed 20% pretest-to-posttest gain for 60% of the students was actually achieved by only 31.6% of the students.

Interpretation:

It is the opinion of the evaluators that the achievement objectives for this program were unrealistic. However, although the objectives were not met, some improvement was noted in test scores. A conservative approach would be to urge caution in the interpretation of the test data because of the lack of norms for the test and the many possible sources of invalidity in the one-group (i.e., no control group) pretest-posttest design.

Report:

Elliott, G. L. and Murray, W. R. Evaluation of the Emergency School Aid Act (ESAA) Bilingual Education Project, 1979-80 (EE80-329-31-09). Dallas, Texas: Dallas Independent School District, Department of Research and Evaluation, September 1980.

EE80-330

Evaluation of the 1979-80 Emergency School Aid Act (ESAA) Basic Project, Cultural Crossroads Center

Evaluators: Gary L. Elliott
Wayne R. Murray

Allocated Budget: $140,240   Number of Pupils: 1560

Cost per Pupil: $90

Number of Pupils: 10

Allocated Staff: 4 Resource Teachers, 1 Media Specialist, 1 Artist, 1 Illustrator, and 1 Secretary

Description: The ESAA Cultural Crossroads Center is a museum-like facility which contains multicultural displays. The Center occupies a portion of the second floor at Urban Park Elementary School. Sixth-grade students from 10 impacted schools were to visit the Center two times during the school year for approximately two hours to view the exhibits and participate in various cultural activities designed to increase their awareness of and appreciation for their own culture as well as the culture of others.

Objective: Students who attended the Center were expected to show higher scores on the Multi-Cultural Awareness Scale which was developed by the Department of Research and Evaluation. Students were given the test either upon their arrival at the Center (pretest) or at the conclusion of their visit (posttest).

Evaluation Results: Students were taken to the Center during the fall semester, but because of lack of funds, they stayed in their regular school and Center personnel visited them during the spring semester. Three Multi-Cultural Awareness Scales were developed and employed and each one reflected higher posttest than pretest scores. Two instruments were used during the fall semester, and the third was used during the spring semester. The average percent correct on the fall pretests were 31.7 and 39.4. The respective posttest average percent correct scores were 39.4 and 49.2. Pretest and posttest average percent correct for the instrument used during the spring semester were 44.2 and 78.4, respectively.

Interpretation: All the data collected for the evaluation of this project indicated the Center did promote awareness of the various cultures in our pluralistic society. The larger gains observed during the spring semester could be attributed to either the type of material presented, the mode of presentation (trips to the Center versus presentation at each school) or the measurement instrument.

Report: Elliott, G. L. and Murray, W. R. Evaluation of the Emergency School Aid Act (ESAA) Basic Project, Cultural Crossroads Center, 1979-80 (EE80-330-31-13). Dallas, Texas: Department of Research and Evaluation, September 1980.

T480-321

Evaluation of the Title IV-C Developing Citizenship Education for Troubled Youth Project

Evaluators:	Fonda Roberson, Vickie Peters, and Wayne R. Murray		
Allocated Budget:	$51,590	Number of Pupils:	Variable
		Cost Per Pupil:	Not Applicable
Number of Schools:	8		
Allocated Staff:	1 Program Facilitator, 1 Curriculum Writer, 1 Clerk		

Description: First-year activities of the Developing Citizenship Education for Troubled Youth Project were aimed at developing and field testing a citizenship curriculum model. The primary purpose of the curriculum was to introduce effective citizenship habits to those students in grades seven and eight identified as status offenders or who had been suspended and/or referred for the District's due process Third Party Hearings. The curriculum was also used with "regular" students in grades four through six to introduce citizenship habits in order to prevent future disruptive behavior. The content of the curriculum was directed toward introducing constructive decision-making and problem-solving skills, improved communication, and increased self-responsibility.

Objectives: The major objectives of the project were: (a) to develop a citizenship curriculum oriented toward decision making and problem solving, communication and social interaction, and self-responsibility; (b) to design the content of the citizenship curriculum; (c) to develop a plan to disseminate the curriculum to other elementary and middle schools in the District; (d) to field test the model with students in the Options Center Program (serving middle school students identified as status offenders) and Mount Saint Michael School for Girls (a private nonprofit school); (e) to field test the curriculum model with a group of "regular" students at a District fourth- through sixth-grade school; and (f) to identify, order, and catalog available literature and reference materials related to citizenship education.

Evaluation Results: The citizenship curriculum was developed on three levels corresponding to the three levels of instruction used in the Options Center Program. All three levels were field tested as they were developed at the Options Centers and Mount Saint Michael School. The Level I curriculum, aimed at making students aware of citizenship concepts, was used in a field test at five fourth- through sixth-grade schools rather than in one as proposed. Classroom observations indicated that the majority of students enthusiastically participated in the use of the curriculum. Options Center teachers varied activities efficiently, but the intermediate school teachers tended not to vary from worksheets and class discussions. The poor classroom management skills of one intermediate teacher interfered with the use of the curriculum in the classroom. Results of a teacher attitude survey concerning the curriculum and its use were generally very positive. Principals of the intermediate field test schools were positive about using the program again. No significant gains were found on pre/posttesting using instruments jointly developed by project staff and evaluators for the intermediate school pilot.

Interpretation: All objectives of the project were attained as proposed. High pretest scores on curriculum tests indicate that students participating in the intermediate field test may already be aware of the concepts presented. Student population characteristics of the schools involved support this conclusion. Greater variety in ethnicity and socioeconomic status of the school populations would possibly have provided more comparative information. Intensive staff development to familiarize teachers with the curriculum is recommended to promote more imaginative variation of activities.

Report: Roberson, F., Peters, V., and Murray, W. R. *Evaluation of the 1979-80 Title IV-C Citizenship Education for Troubled Youth Program* (T480-321-31-05). Dallas, Texas: Dallas Independent School District, Department of Research and Evaluation, September 1980.

T480-322

Evaluation of the Title IV-C Utah System Approach to Individualized Learning (U-SAIL) Program, 1979-80

Evaluators: Fonda Roberson
Vickie Peters
Wayne R. Murray

Allocated Budget: $73,068

Number of Pupils: Not Applicable

Cost per Pupil: Not Applicable

Number of Schools: 22

Allocated Staff: 2 Resource Teachers, 1/2 Clerk Typist

Description: Project U-SAIL was a system for the individualization and improvement of mathematics instruction. It was adapted to the Dallas Mathematics Baseline to provide a framework for instruction for teachers and administrators. The system also emphasized concept mastery of the Dallas Independent School District's Baseline Mathematics objectives.

Objective: The objectives of U-SAIL were (a) to adapt components of the Utah SAIL to DISD's Mathematics Baseline Curriculum, (b) to conduct initial in-service training for principals and teachers, (c) to implement the U-SAIL in classrooms, (d) to provide ongoing staff development for project teachers, and (e) to disseminate information about U-SAIL to others.

Evaluation Results: Due to a delay in project implementation, many evaluation activities were deleted. Adequate staff could not be found for the project due to a District shortage of mathematics teachers. Implementation finally began during January 1980. As a result, no control classes could be designated and students were not exposed to the project for a sufficient length of time for testing. Product information consisted of a teacher survey administered during May 1980. A total of 66 questionnaires were mailed to participating teachers and 76% were returned. The majority of participants responded favorably to each category of items. However, the largest number of negative responses were received on the amount of time required to put the system into operation and on the staff development category.

Process information consisted of sixteen classroom visits during May 1980 and regular visits with project management. All participating teachers received U-SAIL materials but, due to the delay in implementation, many teachers did not have time to complete the system for use during the 1979-80 school year.

Interpretation: Although U-SAIL was not completely implemented as originally specified, most teachers expressed positive attitudes toward the project and project management. It is recommended, however, that with future projects the availability of personnel be given careful consideration during the proposal writing stage. Such consideration would avoid the implementation problems encountered in the U-SAIL project during 1979-80.

Report: Roberson, F., Peters, V., and Murray, W. R. Evaluation of the Title IV-C Utah System Approach to Individualized Learning, 1979-80 (T480-322-31-02). Dallas, Texas: Dallas Independent School District, Department of Research and Evaluation, September 1980.

T480-323

Evaluation of the 1979-80 Title IV-C Teams-Games-Tournament for Fundamentals of Mathematics Program

Evaluators: Vickie Peters,
Ponda Roberson, and
Wayne R. Murray

Allocated Budget: $71,105

Number of Pupils: 832

Cost Per Pupil: $86

Number of Schools: 11

Allocated Staff: 1 Program Manager, 2 Resource Teachers, 1/2 Clerk Typist

Description: The goal of the project was to adopt Teams-Games-Tournament (TGT) strategies and materials for use in Fundamentals of Mathematics (FOM) II classes. The program, which was in its first year of implementation during 1979-80, incorporated teacher instruction, intrateam cooperation, and interteam competition.

Objectives: The objectives of the TGT project were: (a) to adapt TGT materials to the objectives of the FOM course for grades 9 through 12; (b) to provide in-service training for participating teachers and administrators; (c) to provide assistance for local building implementation; and (d) to improve student performance in FOM II classes.

Evaluation Results: Implementation of the TGT program was hampered in several areas as a result of two resource teacher vacancies. Six teachers were employed on an extended-day basis from January through June to adapt TGT materials to the Dallas Mathematics Baseline and to aid in building level implementation. An additional ten teachers worked during June. The adaptation of materials was extended from FOM II objectives to include FOM I, Algebra I, Algebra II, and one unit of geometry.

Most participating teachers worked through a 14-hour practicum on TGT as training. Because of delayed availability of materials, extensive use of TGT was not evident in the classroom until April. Fourteen District teachers reported using TGT with approximately 804 students, 656 of whom were enrolled in FOM classes and 148 in Algebra classes. One teacher from Winston School, the only participating private school, used TGT with 28 students. Because of the limited time of full implementation of TGT, no comparisons of student achievement data were made. Results of student and teacher attitude surveys were generally favorable.

Interpretation: Considerable variation from the original objectives of the program was evident. Adaptation of materials and classroom implementation were delayed because of the staffing problem. An amendment in the fall of 1979 shifted budgetary emphasis from implementation to materials development. The 15 teachers who implemented TGT in the classroom during the project year represented only 63% of the proposed 24 teachers and 38% of the 40 teachers involved in midyear staff development. The use of achievement data was deleted from the project. The developed materials and strategies will be available for future use but benefits during the project year were minimal. It is recommended that availability of potential staff be considered during the proposal planning stage.

Report: Peters, V., Roberson, F., and Murray, W. R. Evaluation of the 1979-80 Title IV-C Teams-Games-Tournament for Fundamentals of Mathematics Program (T480-323-31-01). Dallas, Texas: Dallas Independent School District, Department of Research and Evaluation, September 1980.

T480-324

Evaluation of the 1979-80 Title IV-C Conceptually Oriented Mathematics Program (COMP)

Evaluators: Vickie L. Peters,
Fonda Roberson, and
Wayne R. Murray

Allocated Budget: $30,309

Number of Pupils: 708

Cost Per Pupil: $42

Number of Schools: 2

Allocated Staff: 1 Project Manager

Description: The 1979-80 Title IV-C project was planned to systematically implement the COMP, a sequential small-group mathematics program designed for students in grades one through eight. The diagnostic and prescriptive program provided a list of sequential skills to be mastered in each of the basic skills areas for an individualized approach to mathematics instruction.

Objective: The objectives of COMP were (a) to conduct a needs assessment to determine implementation sites for the program, (b) to design implementation procedures, (c) to disseminate information regarding COMP to appropriate audiences within the District, (d) to reproduce and disseminate materials to implementation sites, (e) to implement and monitor the program, and (f) to implement formative and summative evaluations.

Evaluation Results: Implementation of COMP was delayed approximately four months. The needs assessment failed to take into account that a District-required mathematics management system, the Mathematics Baseline, was already established at Maynard Jackson and Whitney Young. Although placement tests were administered and textbooks were delivered in September, classes were not scheduled to conform to COMP requirements and COMP was not used because of building-level resistance to the simultaneous use of two management systems. District administrators failed to intervene until January, when the requirement to use the Baseline was waived. COMP was fully implemented approximately four months behind schedule. Classroom observations confirmed that the program was in use in the classrooms. On an attitude survey, teachers and administrators at the two schools generally rated the program as average, but the majority were negative about using it again. Because of the late implementation, no achievement data comparisons were made.

Interpretation: All objectives of the project were attained, but classroom implementation was delayed by four months. The needs assessment failed to recognize the commitment most teachers at the two schools felt toward the District's Baseline curriculum. The mid-January decision to waive the Baseline requirement was too late to allow for the COMP to become established to the point of affecting student achievement during the project year. The schools received needed low-level materials from the program, but the cost was midyear disruption of an in-progress curriculum and alienation of teachers. It is recommended that acceptance of a new curriculum be confirmed before that curriculum is scheduled for implementation.

Report: Peters, V. L., Roberson, F., and Murray, W. R. Evaluation of the 1979-80 Title IV-C Conceptually Oriented Mathematics Program (COMP) (T480-324-31-02). Dallas, Texas: Dallas Independent School District, Department of Research and Evaluation, September 1980.

T480-325

Evaluation of the Title IV-C Computer-Assisted Instructional System for Higher Order Reading Skills, 1979-80

Evaluators: Fonda Roberson
Vickie Peters
Wayne R. Murray

Allocated Budget: $94,622

Number of Pupils: Not Applicable

Cost per Pupil: Not Applicable

Number of Schools: Not Applicable

Allocated Staff: 1/2 Project Manager, 1 Senior Analyst, 2 Curriculum Writers

Description: The Computer-Assisted Instructional System for the Higher Order Reading Skills (CARS) Program involved the development of a computer-assisted reading instructional program for fourth- through sixth-grade students. The program concentrated on high-interest, relevant instruction and attempted to improve student inferential and interpretive strategies.

Objective: The eight primary objectives for the program were as follows: (a) to define and delineate higher order reading comprehension skills, (b) to develop a learning hierarchy using a systems approach, (c) to select the appropriate hardware, (d) to develop individualized learning modules, (e) to design and develop individualized learning programs, (f) to develop a teacher's manual, and (g) to design and develop pretests and posttests.

Evaluation Results: Frequent monitoring by evaluation staff indicated that all objectives were completed as specified. Reading comprehension skills were defined and delineated and a learning hierarchy was defined using a systems approach. Individualized learning modules and learning programs were developed in addition to pretests and posttests. The appropriate hardware was selected and work began on the teacher's manual. Pilot testing was rescheduled for the 1980-81 year with approval from the Texas Education Agency.

Interpretation: Except for the pilot test of the CARS system, which was rescheduled with the Texas Education Agency for 1980-81, all activities of the project were carried out as specified. Since CARS was in the developmental stage during 1979-80, no product data were available.

Report: Roberson, F., Peters, V., and Murray, W. R. Evaluation of the Title IV-C Computer-Assisted Instructional System for Higher Order Reading Skills, 1979-80 (T480-325-31-01). Dallas, Texas: Dallas Independent School District, Department of Research and Evaluation, September 1980.

T480-326

Evaluation of the Supplemental Computer-Assisted Instructional System for Higher Order Mathematics Skills, 1979-80

Evaluators: Fonda Roberson
Vickie Peters
Wayne R. Murray

Allocated Budget: $93,514

Number of Pupils: Not Applicable

Cost per Pupil: Not Applicable

Number of Schools: Not Applicable

Allocated Staff: 1/2 Project Manager, 1 Senior Programmer, 1 Curriculum Writer, 1 Secretary

Description: The Supplemental Computer-Assisted Instructional System for Higher Order Mathematics Skills (CAMS) Program involved the development of a supplemental instructional program in mathematics for fourth- through sixth-grade students. The project further provided a method of improving upon skills in which the students were deficient by relating these skills to existing classroom materials.

Objective: The three primary objectives for the project were as follows: (a) to develop computer-based instructional strategies to facilitate problem-solving skills, (b) to develop an integrated individualized mathematics problem-solving instructional system, and (c) to coordinate materials in use within the District with identified problem-solving skills.

Evaluation Results: Frequent monitoring by evaluation staff indicated that all objectives were completed. Piloting of the developed curriculum was delayed until the 1980-81 year with approval from the Texas Education Agency. Computer-based instructional strategies were developed; an integrated, individualized mathematics problem-solving instructional system was developed; and materials within the District were coordinated with identified problem-solving skills. No product data were available for 1979-80.

Interpretation: Except for the pilot test of the CAMS system, which was rescheduled with the Texas Education Agency for 1980-81, all activities of the project were carried out as specified. Since CAMS was in the developmental stage during 1979-80, no product data were available.

Report: Roberson, F., Peters, V., and Murray, W. R. *Evaluation of the Title IV-C Computer-Assisted Instructional System for Higher Order Mathematics Skills, 1979-80* (T480-326-31-01). Dallas, Texas: Dallas Independent School District, Department of Research and Evaluation, September 1980.

T480-327

Evaluation of the Title IV-C Survival Academic Skills for the Deaf Program, 1979-80

Evaluators:	Fonda Roberson Vickie Peters Wayne R. Murray		
Allocated Budget:	$52,009	Number of Pupils:	Not Applicable
		Cost Per Pupil:	Not Applicable
Number of Schools:	1		
Allocated Staff:	1 Curriculum Writer, 1 Clerk Typist, 5 teachers (Summer School), 4 Interpreter-Aides (Summer School)		
Description:	The Survival Academic Skills for the Deaf Program was funded to provide students in the Dallas Regional Day School for the Deaf with a structured language, reading, and mathematics curriculum which emphasized survival skills necessary for productivity in the hearing community. This locally developed curriculum was utilized in conjunction with high-interest and low-reading-level materials drawn from commercially prepared textbooks. These special reading materials were developed by the project staff for implementation in grades 7-12.		
Objectives:	The five main objectives for the program were as follows: (a) to develop a mathematics, language, and reading survival skills scope and sequence of student objectives for low-functioning deaf students in grades K-12, (b) to adapt commercially prepared, high-interest, low-level reading and mathematics textbooks for low-functioning deaf students in grades 7-12, (c) to provide low-functioning deaf students with realistic experiences for application of mathematics, language, and reading skills in a simulated home environment and work-activity center setting, and (d) to provide deaf students in grades 7-12 with the opportunity to improve language, reading, and mathematics skills through attendance in summer school classes.		

Evaluation Results:

All stated objectives were completed by the end of the project year. A mathematics, language, and reading scope and sequence of student objectives was developed and mathematics textbooks were adapted to the program. Additionally, low-functioning deaf students were provided with realistic experiences for the application of mathematics and reading skills in a simulated home environment and work-activity center setting. Summer school classes were provided for deaf students in grades 7-12.

In order to determine overall project performance a teacher attitude survey was administered to all participating summer school teachers. The results were overwhelmingly positive. All teachers indicated that the students responded enthusiastically to the activities and all were pleased with the performance of the project manager.

A 47-item, curriculum-related instrument was administered as the pre- and posttest to summer school students. The average percentage correct on the pretest was 40%, while the average percentage correct on the posttest was 56%. Although the gain of approximately seven correct items was significant, it was considered reasonable to expect a higher level of accuracy on the posttest than the 56% actually obtained since the test was based directly on material taught in the course.

Interpretation:

One possible explanation for the low posttest scores was the wide range of abilities that existed among the participating students. Some students were low achieving, hearing impaired, while other students had multiple handicaps, both mental and physical. It is recommended that future testing procedures be designed to accommodate the varying abilities of students in the program.

Report:

Roberson, F., Peters, V., and Murray, W. R. Evaluation of the Title IV-C Survival Academic Skills for the Deaf Program, 1979-80 (T480-327-31-20). Dallas, Texas: Dallas Independent School District, Department of Research and Evaluation, September 1980.

Evaluation of the 1979-80
Title IV-C Model Accountability System

Evaluators:	Vickie L. Peters, Fonda Roberson, and Wayne R. Murray		
Allocated budget:	$85,971	Number of Pupils:	Not Applicable
		Cost Per Pupil:	Not Applicable
Number of Schools:	1		
Allocated Staff:	2 Senior Evaluators, 2 Assistant Evaluators		

Description: In its second year, the Model Accountability System continued the commitment of the previous year to develop a model public school management information system for setting student performance goals, monitoring classroom instructional conditions, providing continuous reporting of student achievement on criterion-referenced and standardized tests, and specifying techniques for remediation of classroom weaknesses.

Objectives: Specific objectives for 1979-80 were: (a) to revise the existing system and expand it by initiating the addition of reading to the instructional monitoring and goal-setting components developed for mathematics in 1978-79 and by developing a system for computer-generated criterion-referenced achievement tests for mathematics; (b) to field test the accountability system in mathematics and possibly reading across grades one through six; (c) to verify and document components of the system; and (d) to pilot an instructional renewal system.

Evaluation Results: The first objective concerned revision of existing components and expansion by developing computer-generated criterion-referenced tests and a reading component. Two areas of the goal-setting component for mathematics were completed. A learning hierarchy of skills and related Baseline objectives and a system for estimating the time necessary to master objectives were established. The key process of predicting standardized test achievement from Baseline objective mastery was operative using hand-matched objectives and test items. Rasch test equating procedures were in progress to refine the method. The instructional monitoring component included instruments for collecting classroom data concerning instructional methods and student progress and the computer software incorporating

97

these data to report time estimates for student mastery of Baseline objectives. The validity of information obtained from the achievement monitoring component was dependent on the accuracy of the procedure relating standardized test achievement to objectives mastery, the process under refinement in the goal-setting component. The system for developing computer-generated criterion-referenced tests was complete but was not pilot tested as proposed. The reading component was not developed.

The second objective concerned field testing of the Model Accountability System in mathematics and reading. Although some sections of the system operated with data collected from the field test site, the completed mathematics system, with all components operative, was not field tested. Development of the reading component did not reach a field test stage.

The third objective, documenting major components of the system, was completed for developed components. The fourth objective, piloting the renewal system, was completed on schedule as proposed. Responses to an attitude survey administered to teachers participating in the training program for the renewal system were generally positive. Answers to open-ended questions suggested that the training helped teachers identify situations for positive reinforcement of students and provided them with alternatives for coping with student disciplinary problems.

Interpretation:

The major effort associated with each proposed objective was accomplished but some variance was noted. Although revisions were evident and each component of the system was operative, the complete system with all components operating together was not field tested during the project year. Computer-generated criterion-referenced tests were developed but were not pilot tested. Little progress was made on the addition of a reading component. It is recommended that the accountability system be field tested to provide meaningful feedback about the operation of the complete system. It is also recommended that project staff clearly define their intentions regarding the reading component.

Report:

Peters, V. L., Roberson, F., and Murray, W. R. *Evaluation of the 1979-80 Title IV-C Model Accountability System* (T480-331-31-05). Dallas, Texas: Dallas Independent School District, Department of Research and Evaluation, September 1980.

Evaluation of the 1979-80 Title IV-C Occupational and Prevocational Training and Instuctional Options for Special Education Students (Project OPTIONS)

Evaluators: Vickie Peters,
Fonda Roberson, and
Wayne R. Murray

Allocated Budget: $59,514 Number of Pupils: Not Applicable

Cost per Pupil: Not Applicable

Number of Schools: Not Applicable

Allocated Staff: 1 Educational Diagnostician, 1 Secretary

Description: Project Options' third and final year continued the expansion of prevocational and occupational training opportunities for Special Education students by the compilation and dissemination of materials and information sources and the coordination of existing activities to Life Centered Career Education: A Competency Based Approach edited by Donn Brolin.

Objectives: Objectives for the project included: (a) implementing, updating, and evaluating components of the five-year plan; (b) planning for expansion; (c) making additional alternative placement recommendations; (d) developing and disseminating an adaptation of the Donn Brolin curriculum; and (e) training a selected group of teachers to use the curriculum and publishing a newsletter.

Evaluation Results: Activities associated with the first objective were completed, including the formation of a task force combining community and school members, the development of Placement Options Charts, and a review of student demographic data. Activities for objective two, updating Vocational Education for the Handicapped staffing procedures and surveying appraisal team members regarding the vocational appraisal system, were rescheduled. The updated staffing procedures lacked final approval by the Texas Education Agency and the District. The survey was scheduled for completion in August/September staff development. All activities associated with the third objective were completed. Products were updated manpower projections, recommendations for additional special education units, and a summary of results from a vocational follow-up study. The fourth objective concerning the development and dissemination of an adaptation of the Brolin curriculum was complete. The four-volume Career Education Learning Activities was printed and disseminated in June to selected teachers. To complete objective five, a training workshop attended by 25 Special Education teachers was held June 2 through 6 to instruct teachers in the use of the Brolin curriculum and career education. A pre/post cognitive instrument administered to teachers at the workshop showed a significant increase in scores but the final mean score (approximately 52 of 100 possible points) was low. Responses to an attitude survey concerning the quality of the Brolin curriculum and of the workshop were overwhelmingly positive. Five newsletters were published during the project year and were disseminated to Special Education teachers and parents of special education students.

Interpretation:

Products of the project, such as an updated manpower study, demographic charts, and an updated vocational materials center catalog, will serve an ongoing need in the District. The low posttest score after the workshop may indicate that teachers were not well enough acquainted with the Brolin curriculum to use it in the classroom. This is of special concern because the teachers attending the workshop were chosen as representatives from certain student need areas and geographic locations so that they could spread the use of the curriculum to other teachers. More intensive staff development is recommended.

Report:

Peters, V., Roberson, F., and Murray, W. R. Evaluation of the 1979-80 Title IV-C Occupational and Prevocational Training and Instructional Options for Special Education Students (Project Options) (T480-334-31-08). Dallas, Texas: Dallas Independent School District, Department of Research and Evaluation, September 1980.

T780-309

Evaluation of the 1979-80 Title VII Bilingual Demonstration Project

Evaluators: Joseph Gonzales
Stephen W. Hebbler

Allocated Budget: $504,386 Number of Pupils: 417

Cost per Pupil: $1,210

Number of Schools: 6

Allocated Staff: 6 Teachers, 11 Aides, 1 Facilitator

Description: The ESEA Title VII Bilingual Demonstration Project was in its fourth year of implementation during the 1979-80 school year. The five components of this project were: instruction, administration, parent involvement, staff training, and evaluation. There were four public and two non-public schools participating in the project. The public schools were Gabe P. Allen, L. L. Hotchkiss, Sidney Lanier, and Preston Hollow Elementary School. The two non-public schools that participated in the project were Our Lady of Perpetual Help and St. Cecelia.

Gabe P. Allen Elementary School utilized the Region One Literacy Lessons curriculum plus Computer-Assisted Instruction (CAI) with approximately 42 third-grade students and Bolar plus CAI with approximately 47 third-grade students.

L. L. Hotchkiss implemented the Region One Literacy Lessons materials plus a Parent Awareness Component with fourth-grade students. Preston Hollow implemented the Bolar curriculum plus Parent Awareness with fourth-grade students.

Sidney Lanier implemented the Region One Literacy Lessons plus Laidlaw and Palo Alto curricula with one group of fourth-grade students and the Bolar plus Laidlaw and Palo Alto curricula with another group. St. Cecelia implemented the Bolar curriculum with fourth-grade students and Our Lady of Perpetual Help implemented Region One Literacy Lessons curriculum with fourth graders.

Objective: The BDP objectives included: (a) increasing the level of academic achievement of participating limited-English-proficiency students, (b) providing professional growth experiences for project staff,

(c) involving parents of participating students in the educational process, and (d) developing and design testing a set of curriculum materials for use in computer-assisted instruction for third-grade students.

Evaluation Results: A total of 15 workshops were provided by BDP staff to Title-VII teachers and aides. Observations of workshops by the evaluator indicated that the staff development activities provided teachers with useful and timely information. Workshop evaluation questionnaires indicated that the participants felt that the workshops were organized, effective, and useful. A total of 60 classroom observations were made in the DISD and parochial schools. In all but a few cases, the teachers observed seemed to be knowledgeable about the project and were able to carry out the instruction of students as designed. As observed, the materials were implemented as specified. Observations by the evaluation staff and informal talks with parents who had attended meetings and conferences indicated that they were pleased with what the program was doing for their children.

The proposal required the use of the Inter-American Series Test of General Ability and called for 60% of the students to make a 20 percentile point gain (pre-to-post) and the remaining 40% to gain at least 10 percentile points. Since the Test of General Ability is not normed, student progress was examined using raw score gain expressed as a percentage of pretest raw score. Approximately 40% of the BDP target students gained at least 20% of their pretest score while an additional 19% gained between 10% and 19% of their pretest score. A total of 134 BDP target students had both pre- and posttests. The overall average pretest to posttest gain in oral vocabulary was 2.4 raw score points. However, large variations existed from school to school with gains ranging from .7 to 4.6 points.

Interpretation: Overall, the BDP was well implemented during the 1979-80 school year. Activities for each of the program components were carried out as planned. Gains in percentiles could not be computed on the test which was required by the project proposal.

Report: Gonzales, J. and Hebbler, S. W. Evaluation of the 1979-80 Bilingual Demonstration Project (T780-309-31-09). Dallas, Texas: Dallas Independent School District, Department of Research and Evaluation, September 1980.

SP80-365

Evaluation of the Lincoln High School Renewal Project (LHSRP), 1979-80

Evaluator: Johnny Lawton

Allocated Budget: $150,000

Number of Pupils: 1,013

Cost Per Pupil: $148

Number of Schools: 1

Allocated Staff: 1 Coordinator, Renewal Project/Staff Development, 1 Community Relations Specialist, 1 Student Activities Facilitator, 1 Evaluator/Observer, 1 Home School Coordinator, 1 Secretary, 1 Community Liaison, and 1 Reading Facilitator

Description: The Lincoln High School Renewal Project (LHSRP) was a program designed to develop a renewal model for teaching lower-income, low achieving students in secondary urban schools. This was the sixth year of this annually funded program.

Objective: There were several areas addressed in the model's development, including raising student achievement and increasing student, parental and community involvement. The data collected from these areas of interest were to be used for making decisions regarding the educational program at LHS and for further development of the model.

Evaluation Results: Funding for the September 1979-August 1980 LHSRP was not received until January 1980. As a result of the funds being allocated at such a late date, personnel could not be reassigned immediately to the LHSRP. Only the community liaison, student activities facilitator and the evaluator/observer were assigned to LHS, although attempts were made to also employ a coordinator, community relations specialist and a secretary. In addition, the principal/director died in February 1980, and the project was placed on hold status until a new principal/director could be employed. A new principal/director was employed during April 1980, and he chose to leave the project on hold until the 1980-81 school year. Thus, during 1979-80 LHS was more indicative of a regular high school than a renewal program. Basic Objectives Assessment Test (BOAT) scores and scores from the Tests of Achievement and Proficiency (TAP) were collected for LHS students. Of those students who received the BOAT, 20% passed (i.e., answered correctly at least 70% of the 125 Items on the test). Median scores on the TAP for all grade levels and tests were below the 25th percentile for large-city norms.

Interpretation: The LHSRP was not operational during the 1979-80 school year. Late funding and the death of the principal/director, who had managed the project since it began in 1974-75, were the primary reasons the program did not operate. The test data which were collected during 1979-80 indicated that LHS students on the average functioned far below the norm for large cities (as indicated by the TAP) and below minimum competence levels of other District students (as indicated by the BOAT). The data, which will serve as the base for future comparisons as the program becomes operational, clearly indicate the need for improvements in the LHS instructional program.

Report: Lawton, J. Evaluation of the Lincoln High School Renewal Project (LHSRP), 1979-80 (SP80-365-31-30). Dallas, Texas: Dallas Independent School District, Department of Research and Evaluation, September 1980.

SP80-380

Evaluation of the 1979-80 Better Reading Through Parents (BRTP) Program

Evaluators: Gwen R. White
Wayne R. Murray

Allocated Budget: $95,452

Number of Pupils: Not Applicable

Cost per Pupil: Not Applicable

Number of Schools: Not Applicable

Allocated Staff: 1 Director, 1 Manager, 1 Part-time Facilitator, 1 Part-time Aide, 15 Teachers, 10 Specialists, 2 Telephone Specialists, 1 Consultant, 1 Secretary

Description: The BRTP program, funded by the Emergency School Aid Act, was a parental involvement program managed by Human Systems, Inc., Dallas, Texas. The BRTP Program involved the parents of children who were being bused to achieve racial desegregation. Additionally, the program involved parents who were anticipating the possibility of their children being bused.

Objective: The BRTP Program was designed to educate parents on how to assist in their children's language development and to stimulate their interest in reading.

Evaluation Results: Two populations were used to examine the effect of the program on students' reading achievement. Students whose parents participated in the program during the 1979-80 school year comprised the group for the first analysis. Spring 1979 ITBS (Form 5) Reading Comprehension Test scores served as the pretest for this group while Spring 1980 ITBS (Form 7 or 8) was used as the posttest. In order to study the effect of the program over a longer period of time, students whose parents participated in the program during the 1978-79 school year were used in a second analysis. In this analysis the spring 1978 ITBS Reading Comprehension Test (Form 5) was used as the pretest and spring 1980 (Form 7 or 8) was used as the posttest.

Matches were obtained for 70 students in grades 2-6 for the analysis of the 1979-80 data. Mean grade equivalent scores summarizing the analysis for all grades combined are presented below.

	Pretest	Posttest
BRTP	3.16	4.09
Non-BRTP	3.17	3.84

The lack of difference in the pretest scores indicates that the matching procedure was effective.

Mean grade equivalent posttest scores for students associated with the BRTP were higher than those of the control group. This difference (0.25 grade equivalents) was statistically significant.

The analysis to examine the long-term effects of the program was conducted in a similar manner to the analysis discussed above. However, no differences were observed between the two comparison groups.

Interpretation: In the main, the BRTP program was implemented as specified in the proposal. One interpretation for the seemingly contradictory results reported above is that the positive effects of the program may have faded over time. Another is that the program was more effective during the 1979-80 school year than it was in 1978-79.

Report: White, G. R., and Murray, W. R. Evaluation of the 1979-80 Better Reading Through Parents (BRTP) (SP80-380-31-01). Dallas, Texas: Dallas Independent School District, Department of Research and Evaluation, September 1980.

SP80-381

Evaluation of the 1979-80
American Indian Education Program

Evaluators: Linda K. Zimmerer
Wayne E. Carter

Allocated Budget: $85,588 Number of Pupils: 601

Cost per Pupil: $142

Number of Schools: Not Applicable

Allocated Staff: 1 Manager, 2 School Liaisons, 1 Secretary

Description: The American Indian Education Program was to involve numerous activities for the benefit of both American Indian and non-American Indian students and staff in the Dallas Independent School District (DISD). Through a program of counseling, tutoring, community involvement, and resource development, the American Indian Education Program sought to continue to (a) improve DISD American Indian students' self-esteem and potential for academic success, (b) promote greater awareness of American Indian culture among DISD non-American Indian staff and students, and (c) improve DISD's response to the unique educational needs of American Indian students.

Objective: The American Indian Education Program was to continue to identify DISD American Indian students and to track their educational experience and progress. The tutoring program, personal and academic counseling, group activities, and the encouragement of American Indian community involvement in supportive educational activities were to be continued. The American Indian Awareness Program and the American Indian Resource Center were to be expanded. A room was to be furnished as a resource center with American Indian artifacts for student use. Finally, a course of study was to be developed to describe the culture and history of the four predominant tribes in the Dallas area: the Choctaw, Navajo, Cherokee, and Sioux.

Evaluation Results: The majority of the activities of the American Indian Education Program were carried out as proposed and most of the proposed activities were completed as scheduled. The activities which were not completed by the end of the school year were: (a) the identification and certification of the American Indian students; (b) the tribal history of the Cherokee, Navajo, and Sioux tribes; (c) the dissemination of the tribal history materials; and (d) the compilation of a list of available American Indian resource materials.

There was a total of 601 American Indian students identified on the DISD student data base during 1979-80. Due to extenuating circumstances ranging from changes in enrollment certification forms to the lack of tribal membership records, only 187 student enrollment certification forms had been completed as of June 26, 1980.

The tutoring program experienced a limited implementation. Three students received individual tutoring daily, seven students were tutored on a temporary basis, and ten students were tutored occasionally. Three tutors were available at the Program office at James W. Fannin School.

In general, materials were supplied for students' use. Social activities such as dances, talent contests, and sporting events were held, and educational, community involvement, and awareness activities were conducted. Tribal history classes for the Choctaw and Cherokee tribes were conducted at Mountain View college but were attended by only a small number of participants.

Interpretation: Moderate implementation of the program was documented but numerous activities were sponsored by the American Indian Education Program throughout the year. Some of these activities were co-sponsored by the program and by other American Indian organizations in the area. The largest hindrance in the completion of the proposed activities seemed to arise from the high turnover of staff, primarily due to low salaries. Because of the failure to complete the proposed activities, the program received a grant extension to complete these activities during the summer months. It is recommended that, if this program is to become more effective, attention should be paid to the recruitment of a more stable program staff.

Report: Zimmerer, L. K., and Carter, W. E. Evaluation of the 1979-80 American Indian Education Program (SP80-381-31-11). Dallas, Texas: Dallas Independent School District, Department of Research and Evaluation, September 1980.

SP80-382

Evaluation of the 1979-80 Nutrition Education Project

Evaluators: Gwen R. White
Wayne R. Murray

Allocated Budget: $99,394

Number of Pupils: Not Applicable

Cost per Pupil: Not Applicable

Number of Schools: Not Applicable

Allocated Staff: 1 Project Manager, 1 Part-time Specialist, 1 Administrative clerk

Description: During the previous year (1978-79), the staff of the Nutrition Education Project developed an item pool from which tests could be constructed to assess nutrition education. Activities in the current project year focused on the statewide field testing of the item pool.

Objective: The nine project objectives were (a) to conduct a literature review on nutrition education; (b) to summarize the findings of the review; (c) to construct a sixth-grade level nutrition test from the items in the pool for Regions X and XX Education Service Centers; (d) to print and disseminate the test to the participating local education agencies; (e) to analyze the field test data for Region X Education Service Center (ESC); (f) to revise the test instruments on the basis of the field test data; (g) to conduct a workshop on the benefit and use of the nutrition item pool for Education Service Center Personnel; (h) to conduct a statewide survey of responses to the project draft of an Administrative Implementation Procedure Guide based on the Dallas Independent School District's nutrition education program; and (i) to prepare a final report on the project for the Texas Education Agency.

Evaluation Results: A process evaluation was conducted to monitor the program activities. The workshop on assessing nutrition education was held on December 13, 1979. A sixth-grade level nutrition test was constructed from the item pool and disseminated to 19 Regional Education Service Centers. The analysis of test results and test revision were still in progress at the time this report was written. The construction of two sixth-grade level tests for Region XX was not completed. The results of the field testing, the literature review and the revision of the Administration Implementation Procedure Guide will be included in the project final report.

Interpretation: The Nutrition Education Program appeared to be implemented as designed. Review of the forthcoming project manager's report will provide greater insight into the products produced during the 1979-80 school year.

Report: White, G. R., and Murray, W. R. Evaluation of the Nutrition Education Project, 1979-80 (SP80-382-31-04). Dallas, Texas: Dallas Independent School District, Department of Research and Evaluation, September 1980.

SP80-383

Evaluation of the Summer Skills Youth Employment Program (SSYEP), 1979

Evaluators: Gwen R. White
Wayne R. Murray

Allocated Budget: $65,935 Number of Pupils: 113

Cost per Pupil: $583

Number of Schools: Not Applicable

Allocated Staff: 1 Coordinator, 4 Counselors, 1 Secretary

Description: The SSYEP was a six-week program designed for youths who had met the neighborhood Youth Corps' economic criteria, had just finished high school, and wanted to enter the job market.

Objective: The objective of the SSYEP was to provide vocational instruction and on-the-job training for youth who were economically disadvantaged.

Evaluation Results: A majority of the participating students had a favorable attitude toward the SSYEP. Also, employers gave the program an adequate rating and would like to participate in the program again. Of the 113 students enrolled in the program, 64 (56.6%) completed the program. Among the 64 students who completed the program, 33 (51.6%) were placed on jobs. A comparison of the SSYEP over a three-year period showed a decline in enrollment and also a decline in the number of students who completed the program.

Interpretation: The program appeared to be implemented as designed. More than half of the students were placed on jobs which required skills obtained through the SSYEP.

Report: White, G. R., and Murray, W. R. Evaluation of the Summer Skills Youth Employment Program (SSYEP), 1979 (SP80-383-31-07). Dallas, Texas: Dallas Independent School District, Department of Research and Evaluation, September 1980.

SP80-384

Evaluation of the 1979-80 Services Provided by the Dallas Chamber of Commerce for the Dallas Independent School District

Evaluators: Evelyn Y. Reed, Wayne R. Murray

Allocated Budget: $151,886

Number of Pupils: Not Applicable

Cost per Pupil: Not Applicable

Number of Schools: Not Applicable

Allocated Staff: 1 Executive Director, 1 Communications Specialist, 1 Program Specialist, and 1 Manager

Description: The contract between the Dallas Independent School District (DISD) and the Dallas Chamber of Commerce (DCC) was funded during 1979-80 so that the DCC could continue to coordinate business community support of career education programs along with promotion of community understanding and support of quality desegregated public education.

Objective: The DCC staff was to provide documentation and detail a plan of action that would assist the DISD in solving problems related to career education, desegregation, the high school Talented and Gifted (TAG) program, and the Adopt-a-School partnership process. They were also to function as the secretariat for the Career Education Advisory Board (CEAB) of the Skyline Career Development Center (CDC), other occupational clusters, and their committees. In addition, the DCC staff was to cooperate in producing viable models suitable for adaptation in other large urban areas.

Evaluation Results: In general, the project seemed to be implemented as designed. The DCC staff provided overall coordination of business community support for DISD career education programs, desegregation, the TAG program, and the Adopt-a-School program. The chairpersons of the CEAB and CDC Advisory Committees, when surveyed, agreed that effective and facilitative coordination had been provided for their committees. Magnet school directors and cluster coordinators reported that resources had been provided or developed and the amount of involvement by DCC staff had been adequate. Most of the principals of the adopted schools felt that the services/resources had a positive effect and had favorably impacted the lives of the students involved. The TAG students, who responded to a questionnaire designed to gather their impressions of the program, agreed that the program had provided exposure to, and experience in, a professional work atmosphere and that it had been an advantageous and maturing experience.

Interpretation: The contract between the DISD and DCC seemed to have a positive impact on the lives of the students in the DISD. It would appear that the District has established a viable partnership with the business community, using the DCC staff as the link for maintaining this synergistic relationship.

Report: Reed, E. Y., and Murray, W. R. Evaluation of the 1979-80 Services Provided by the Dallas Chamber of Commerce for the Dallas Independent School District (SP80-384-31-05). Dallas, Texas, Dallas Independent School District, Department of Research and Evaluation, September 1980.

SP80-408

Evaluation of the Dunbar SUCCESS Program, 1979-80

Evaluator: Ted O. Almaguer

Allocated Budget: $23,574

Number of Pupils: 250

Cost per Pupil: $94

Number of Schools: 1

Allocated Staff: Nine instructors and one project director

Description: The SUCCESS program was designed to introduce students to effective reading and writing practices by providing both group and individualized instruction. The program was based on the belief that people should be taught to read and write about the materials that are readily accessible to them, such as magazines, newspapers, catalogues, maps, telephone books, and so on. In theory, the implementation of this program requires two professional instructors per classroom.

Objectives: The objectives of the program were to improve students' reading and writing skills and to enhance students' self-concepts.

Evaluation Results: During the site visits to the SUCCESS Program, several practices were observed which were inconsistent with the SUCCESS curriculum. First, one instructor gradually moved away from the SUCCESS curriculum to the District's baseline curriculum. Two other instructors merged the basic components of the two curricula throughout the year. These practices were inconsistent with the descriptions they had given earlier in one-to-one interviews regarding their individual proposed curriculum designs. These departures from the SUCCESS curriculum probably occurred as a result of the lack of instructional assistance in their classes. All but one of the nine instructors were without assistance. The ninth instructor had one full-time aide.

The students did not demonstrate significant gains in reading achievement or self-concept as measured by the Iowa Tests of Basic Skills and the Primary Self-Concept Inventory, respectively. A significant gain in reading achievement was defined as a one year grade equivalent increase on the ITBS. Statistics on the first-grade students' reading achievement gains are not available since their pretests, the Metropolitan Reading Readiness Tests, are different from their posttests, the ITBS. A significant gain in self-concept was defined as a difference between posttest and pretest which was statistically significant. ITBS reading and self-concept scores were as follows:

	ITBS Reading		Self-Concept (Max Score=18)	
	Spring 1979	Spring 1980	Pretest	Posttest
Grade 1			12.1	14.0
Grade 2	1.4	2.1	14.9	15.2
Grade 3	2.0	3.3	13.9	15.6

Interpretation:

If the program had been implemented as specified, one would be led to conclude that the SUCCESS curriculum failed to produce any significant gains in reading achievement or self-concept. However, the program was not implemented as specified. Two major variations were observed. First, some instructors modified or abandoned the basic components of the SUCCESS curriculum. Second, the program, for all practical purposes, was implemented with no instructional support. This was clearly a violation of the theoretical framework of the SUCCESS program as proposed by project management. In the evaluator's opinion, then, the results are not only inconclusive but are rather meaningless as a result of two major departures from the proposed curriculum design.

Report:

Almaguer, T. O. Evaluation of the Dunbar SUCCESS Program, 1979-80 (SP80-408-31-01). Dallas, Texas: Dallas Independent School District, Department of Research and Evaluation, September 1980.

SP80-431

Evaluation of the Lau Program, 1979-80

Evaluators: Ted O. Almaguer and Gary S. Daniel

Allocated Budget: $1,655,563 Number of Pupils: 8,386

Cost per pupil: Approximately $197

Number of Schools: 131

Allocated Staff: 32 Resource, 48 Bilingual, and 25 English-as-a-Second-Language teachers

Description: The Lau Program offered Bilingual and English-as-a-Second-Language (ESL) instruction to students of Limited English Proficiency (LEP). The bilingual curriculum included subject matter instruction and language development both in English and in Spanish. In addition, the bilingual curriculum focused on the development of students' self-confidence, self-concept, and positive attitudes toward their cultural heritage. The ESL curriculum, on the other hand, stressed primarily the comprehension and utilization of the English language. More specifically, the ESL instruction emphasized the development of students' listening, speaking, reading, and writing skills.

Objectives: The main intent of the Lau Program was to help students of limited English proficiency to effectively participate in the District's English-based educational program. The objectives of the program were (a) to identify these students, (b) to categorize them with respect to their level of language proficiency, and (c) to provide them with additional language services.

Evaluation Results: Measures of English language proficiency have been administered to 19,762 students. Of these students, 8,160 elementary and 1,667 secondary students have been identified as potential LEP students. Figures extracted from the District's data base show that program services were made available to 8,386 students. ESL program services were made available to 3,205 elementary, 427 middle, and 333 high school students; 4,421 elementary students received bilingual instruction. Unannounced site visits to a preselected sample of schools (N=52) showed that considerable progress was made in delivering services to these children. However, it should be brought to the reader's attention that there was systematic variation in the delivery of services to these students. This variability existed not only between schools but was also prevalent within schools. Several factors and/or conditions were identified which were contributing to this variability. They included: (a) shortages in certified Bilingual instructors, (b) inequitable allocations in teaching resources across and within schools, (c) communication breakdowns between the Bilingual Department and instructors, (d) unreasonable demands on secondary teachers for the testing of LEP students, (e) obsolete exiting and monitoring subsystems for students of limited English proficiency, and (f) increasing numbers of non-Spanish-speaking LEP students. For a complete enumeration of the factors or conditions contributing to the variability in the delivery of services to LEP students, the reader is referred to report number SP80-431-31-09 entitled Evaluation of the Lau Program, 1979-80.

Interpretation: The District is still experiencing a severe shortage in certified Bilingual instructors. The recruitment of additional instructors should be one of the District's highest priority items. Some non-Spanish-speaking subpopulations of LEP students are reaching proportions where the District may be legally bound to provide them with Bilingual curricula. The size of these subpopulations need to be monitored carefully. The Bilingual Department may wish to begin planning for the delivery of bilingual services to these children. More personnel are needed to monitor the delivery of services to these children in an effort to reduce the amount of variation in the delivery of services to them. The exiting and monitoring subsystems for students of limited English proficiency are obsolete. An interactive information storage and retrieval system with monitoring and exiting capabilities should be developed during the upcoming year.

Report: Almaguer, T. O. and Daniel, G. S. Evaluation of the Lau Program, 1979-80 (SP80-431-31-09). Dallas, Texas: Dallas Independent School District, Department of Research and Evaluation, September 1980.

Evaluation of the 1979-80 Peer Tutoring Program

Evaluator: Robert P. Grobe

Allocated Budget: $217,188 Number of Pupils: Approximately 8,000

Expenditures: $189,684 Cost per Pupil: Approximately $24

Number of Schools: 50

Allocated Staff: 1 Senior Analyst, 6 Program Facilitators, 2 Resource Aides

Description: The District's Peer Tutoring Program (PTP) in Developmental Reading and Mathematics are remedial programs coordinated by the Tutoring Branch of the Learning Services Department. The program is an alternative or supplemental learning form for students who are one year or more below their grade level in basic reading and computational skills. Students tutor other students with a professional or paraprofessional managing the program in the individual school.

Generally, the PTP was implemented such that tutoring occurred on a daily basis. Additionally, students were to stay in the tutoring program at least one quarter. A manual describing step by step procedures for implementing the PTP is available. The manual details information pertaining to how the program works, recruitment of tutors, tutor training, operating procedures, record keeping, testing, and material used.

Objective: Student achievement objectives are that the tutors would gain 1.5 months achievement growth in reading and mathematics per month in the program and that tutees would gain one month of growth per month in the program.

Evaluation Results: To test the attainment of the stated program objectives, the number of tutors and tutees attaining the achievement growth criterion in vocabulary, reading comprehension, and mathematics computation was tallied. The percent of tutors gaining at least 1.5 months achievement growth per month was 54 percent for vocabulary, 51 percent for comprehension, and 61 percent for computation. The percent of tutees gaining at least 1.0 months achievement growth per month was 62 percent for vocabulary, 54 percent for comprehension, and 64 percent for computation.

As additional information, the average achievement gain per month of instruction was calculated for tutors and tutees. For tutors in grades 7 through 11, the average achievement gain per month of instruction was 2.4 months for vocabulary, 1.5 months for comprehension, and 2.5 months for computation. For tutees in grades 7 through 11, the average achievement gain per month of instruction was 2.6 months for vocabulary, 2.2 months for comprehension, and 2.2 months for computation.

Interpretation:

Several points need to be made about these results. First, the stated objectives imply 100 percent of the students will make the indicated gains. Thus, the objectives obviously were not attained. The second point is that the stated objectives are extremely difficult, if not impossible, to attain. A feasible, yet worthy, objective would be that 75 percent of the students would make such gains in achievement. Information which summarizes achievement gains suggests that while the Peer Tutoring Program worked for the majority of students, it did not work for all students. The implication is that efforts should be made to identify those students for whom the program does not work, exit those students from the program, and place other students in the program.

Report:

Grobe, R. P. Evaluation of the 1979-80 Peer Tutoring Program (SP80-447-31-20). Dallas, Texas: Dallas Independent School District, Department of Research and Evaluation, September 1980.